

THE UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

CHRISTIANITY AND THE STATE IN THE FIRST CENTURY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
(BY COURSEWORK)

DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES

BY
STEPHANUS JACOBUS TITUS

CAPE TOWN

1985

The University of Cape Town has been given
the right to reproduce this thesis in whole
or in part. Copyright is held by the author.

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE STATE IN THE FIRST CENTURY

TITUS, STEPHANUS JACOBUS, M.A. UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN, 1985.

This dissertation studies the New Testament perspective of the Christian's attitude and duty towards the State. In it the first chapter is devoted to an investigation of the political attitude of Jesus of Nazareth as can be recovered from his reported actions and pronouncements concerning the Roman government of his day and his instructions to his followers about violence and their duties towards the State. Special attention is paid to the reasons for his crucifixion. In the second chapter an exegetical study is made of the apostle Paul's teachings about the State in Romans 13:1-7; and the third chapter is an exegetical discussion of Revelation 13 in which John assumes a very negative attitude towards the State. In the final short chapter the author draws the conclusion that as early as the first Christian century the attitude of the Church towards the State was to a large extent determined by the State's treatment of the Church. Although a definite difference is evident between the attitudes of Paul and John towards the State, they agree with Jesus that the State has a definite place in the divine order of the universe. This fact requires of the Christian and other citizens to give loyalty to the State what it needs for its existence, to submit to its authority and

obey just laws, to pray for those in authority, reject violence, resist any religio-ideological claims or injustices of the State, and participate in the prophetic role of the Church in relation to the State.

DECLARATION

I declare that this dissertation is my own, unaided work. It is being submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts (by Coursework) in the University of Cape Town. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in *any* other University.

Signed by candidate

STEPHANUS JACOBUS TITUS

The first day of September, 1985.

Dedicated to my wife, Annelène,
my children, Zoé, Saville, and
Thirzah, and to Sabina Weyers.

INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
Preface	vi
Introduction	viii
1. Jesus' attitude to the State	1
2. Paul and the State	66
3. The State in the Book of Revelation	102
4. Conclusions	152
Notes	159
Select Bibliography	197

PREFACE

The problem of Church and State is doubtlessly one of the most contentious and crucial topics especially in South Africa, where opinions differ radically over how people ought to conduct themselves in relation to civil government. Issues such as the use of violence to effect political change, civil disobedience and conscientious objection to war are old problems which remain unsolved, while new problems such as praying for the overthrow of an unjust government, disinvestment to effect change, and so forth, arise in rapid succession. The New Testament perspective on Church and State relationships remain an important consideration in a country such as South Africa where the majority of people claim to be Christians. This fact justifies in my judgment yet another study of the political views of Jesus, Paul and John of Revelation. It is hoped that the present work will help to clarify some of the issues under discussion at present.

I wish to express my sincere thanks to Prof. John de Gruchy of the Religious Studies Department at the University of Cape Town, who tirelessly organized for me to realize a long-held desire to do post graduate studies, as well as the United Congregational Church of Southern Africa who elected me as a candidate for this training in preparation for teaching at the Federal

Theological Seminary of Southern Africa. The general secretary of the U.C.C.S.A., Rev. Joseph Wing, has been a friend and father to me throughout my years of study and I feel grateful to him. Dr. C.A. Wanamaker, supervisor of this dissertation and my mentor during three years at Cape Town University is also thanked most sincerely. I hope that his love and respect for the text of the New Testament will in this dissertation be proved to have rubbed off on this student of his. This dissertation has been dedicated to my loving and supportive wife and children, as well as to our housekeeper, Sabina Weyers, who has in her own way been a continual inspiration to me.

Finally, I thank Mrs Wendy Jacobs for typing the final draft of this dissertation and the Human Sciences Research Council for their financial assistance during my final year of study. The views expressed and the possible errors of judgment made in this dissertation are the sole responsibility of the author.

STEVE TITUS

PIETERMARITZBURG

1 September 1985

INTRODUCTION

"For the distinction between Christians and other men ,
is neither in country nor language nor customs.

.....while living Greekⁱⁿ or barbarian cities
they show forth the wonderful and confessedly strange
character of the constitution of their citizenship.

They dwell in their own fatherlands, but as if so-
journers in them; they share all things as citizens,
and suffer all things as strangers. Every foreign
country is their fatherland, and every fatherland is
a strange country.

They pass their time upon the earth, but they have
their citizenship in heaven.

They obey the appointed laws, and they surpass the
laws in their own lives" (The Epistle to Diognetus 5:
1, 4, 5, 9, 10).

From the earliest Christian times Christians have re-
garded themselves as the *πολίτευμα* , the community
of the coming age, who are sojourners on the earth.

This eschatological character of the Christian faith in-
evitably raises the question of what attitude Christians
should assume towards the present earthly State. In-
stead of simply being indifferent to the world, the
early apology quoted above shows that Christians take
very serious their dealings with the world. Although
the earthly State is seen as temporary and provisional,

it is neither renounced in principle nor uncritically affirmed by Christians. The chapters that follow will attempt to make clear the complex attitude which the New Testament portrays towards the State.

This will be done in view of the fact that in our day and age the proper attitude of the Christian towards the State is still a contentious and controversial issue. The true attitude of Jesus concerning the State is still hotly debated today. There are those, on the one hand, who maintain that Jesus was a "Zealot", who wanted to start a violent revolution to overthrow the Roman government while, on the other hand, others believe that he was a pacifist and a spiritual Messiah. There is still raging a long standing controversy between those who believe that Paul in Romans 13:1-7 commanded complete obedience to the State, on the one hand, and others who refer to Revelation 13 as a contradiction of Romans 13:1-7, on the other hand. In the mean time new questions have arisen such as: What is the New Testament basis for conscientious objection to war, civil disobedience, and prayer for the overthrow of an unjust government? The purpose of this mini-thesis is to once again investigate the political attitude of Jesus in the light of his pronouncements concerning the State, his position in regard to the Zealots, and his crucifixion as a result of his alleged claim to be King of the Jews. Our first chapter will deal with these and related issues, while in chapter two we shall make an exegetical study

of Paul's words concerning the Christian's obligations to the State in order to come to a better understanding of what the apostle meant. Chapter three will deal with the apparently contradictory attitude which John of Revelation displays in relation to Romans 13. The aim of the whole exercise is to draw conclusions from the material we discuss, which may serve as directions for those who value the biblical perspective and allow them to interpret the principles in terms of their own life situations.

Other New Testament passages which contain teachings on Church and State relationships, such as 1 Peter 2:13ff. and Titus 3:1f., have been excluded from this study, because of their literary and material affinity to Romans 13:1-7 which make them add very little to the earlier text.

From ^{our} discussion of the political positions of Jesus, Paul and John of Revelation we should be able to see that Jesus was not a Zealot, nor did he contemplate a violent overthrow of the Roman government. He was a revolutionist in the sense that he sought the establishment of the Kingdom of God to replace all oppression and injustice. Jesus, Paul and John are in agreement that all kingly power derives from God, that the State has an important place and task in God's order of the world and that all citizens ought to submit to the government. They must, however, remain critical of the State's demands and performance in the light

of God's demands and resist claims from the State which are in conflict with God's higher claims. We shall to a limited extent be able to also detect in our discussion of earliest Christianity a tendency on the side of the Church to judge the State according to the treatment received from it.

CHAPTER 1

JESUS' ATTITUDE TO THE STATE

In the final chapter of his book, The Service of God (1), C.E.B. Cranfield sets out the various ranges of material which ought to be taken into account in assessing Jesus' attitude to the state according to the New Testament. Firstly these include passages containing direct exhortation on the subject such as Mark 12:13-17 and parallels (Matt. 22:15-22 and Luke 20:20-26); secondly, passages which, while not containing exhortations on the subject, have some sort of reference to the State. In this regard he mentions Mark 10:42 and parallels (Matt. 20:25 and Luke 22:25), and Mark 13:9 and parallels (Matt. 10:18 and Luke 21:12-13). The Passion and Birth narratives are also important, according to Cranfield, although he does not elaborate on how the Birth narratives have a bearing on Jesus' political attitude. The third category which Cranfield mentions, and which does not concern us here, has to do with the Christian's responsibility to the State in general and not Jesus' attitude in particular. Cranfield hastens to say that this survey is not exhaustive, and rightly so (2).

The scope of our field of investigation into the political attitude of Jesus is much more fully indicated in the controversial work of S.G.F. Brandon (3) and

Oscar Cullmann's work which Brandon presupposes(4). In order to get an overall view of the texts and issues which ought to be addressed by our present survey of Jesus' attitude towards the State (5) of his time, we must therefore outline Brandon's theses.

Like Cullmann and D.R. Griffiths (6), Brandon takes as starting point for his investigation of Jesus' attitude to the Roman State the Nazarene's relation to the Zealots. In his book, Jesus and the Zealots, Brandon revives the theory associated with Reimarus and Eisler (7) that Jesus and his followers were sympathetic to the Zealot ideal and aims, including the use of violence (8). This fact was, however carefully erased by the writers of the Synoptic Gospels, who replaced it with the portrait of the "pacific Christ". We are not only left with a distorted picture of Jesus from the Gospel writers who, for apologetic reasons, covered up his Zealot connections, but we also have a distorted picture of the Zealots from Josephus, who has blackened the Zealots as mere brigands, in order to put on them the blame for the war against Rome. So, although Jesus was crucified as a rebel by the Roman authorities in Jerusalem, the Gospels and Acts take pains to represent him as innocent of the charge, a victim of a "frame-up by the High Priest and his associates (8). Mark's gospel is described by Brandon as an Apologia ad Christianos Romanos. By this he means that it was written for the Roman world to commend Jesus as Son of God,

and therefore had an interest in demonstrating Jesus' innocence of the political charge against him, and dissociating Jesus from the Jewish cause. Enough traces remain, however, to show the true situation. Apart from the confirmed Zealot, Simon, Jesus probably had more Zealots among his disciples (notably Peter, Judas Iscariot, and the Sons of Thunder, James and John). So Jesus cannot have regarded the Zealot aspirations of these disciples as inconsistent with his own mission (9). Luke 22:35-37, which is placed just before his arrest, depicts Jesus as instructing his disciples to arm themselves with swords. At least one of the disciples was armed when Jesus was arrested. His "triumphal entry" into Jerusalem had been carefully planned as a Messianic demonstration (Mk. 11:1-10), and his "cleansing" of the Temple was a direct attack on the "sacerdotal aristocracy" which the Roman garrison in Antonia could hardly have failed to notice. Brandon further finds it significant that Jesus, according to the Gospels, condemns the Sadducees, Pharisees and Herodians, but never explicitly the Zealots. His sympathy with the poor and downtrodden and his attacks on the rich and influential also point toward the fact that Jesus had strong Zealot tendencies. While the saying on "cross bearing" (Mk. 8:34-37) shows a characteristic Zealot readiness for martyrdom (10).

In the Passion narrative Barabbas, who according to the Gospels was released by Pilate rather than Jesus,

is termed a *λῃστής* (robber or brigand: John 18:40), this is precisely the word used by Josephus for the Jewish guerillas. In Mark 15:27 and Matt. 27:38, 44 the same word is used for the two men crucified with Jesus. It follows for Brandon that all three men crucified on that day were executed as rebels. Also, according to Mark 15:17, Barabbas had been imprisoned with "the rebels who had committed murder during the revolt". This revolt is identified by Brandon as a "Zealot revolt" roughly coinciding with Jesus' "cleansing" of the Temple (11). The concern of the Jewish authorities that there should not be a riot during the Passover festival (Matt. 26:5 = Mk. 14:2) fits well with Josephus' description of the often volatile situation during the sixty years prior to the war of A.D. 66, and especially the first few years of Pilate's administration. At the major festivals many thousands of Jews streamed into Jerusalem from the Diaspora and the country areas of Palestine and religious fervour and national sentiment ran high. Brandon sees in the charge laid against Jesus in Luke 23:2 a clear link with the picture given by Josephus of the policy of Judas the Galilean, founder of the "Fourth Philosophy", who in A.D. 6

"incited his countrymen to revolt, upbraiding them as cowards for consenting to pay tribute to the Romans and tolerating mortal masters, after having God for their Lord" (12).

Brandon's theory has been stated in some detail in order

to bring out the wide ranging texts and issues which, in addition to the few mentioned by Cranfield, demand our attention in a discussion of Jesus' political attitude. Commenting on Brandon's thesis F.C. Grant wrote:

"If one disagrees with him, saying so is futile: the whole argument must be unwoven and redone by someone equally competent" (13).

The formidability of such a task is probably the reason why it took New Testament scholars sixteen years since the appearance of Brandon's work to bring out a collection of 26 essays which address the various aspects of Brandon's reconstruction of what sort of person Jesus was (14). It is impossible to do justice to the kind of task envisaged by Grant's comment within the limits of the present work, and therefore we will undertake in this first chapter to assess Jesus' attitude to the State according to the agenda set for us by Cranfield. But first we must examine whether Jesus was a Zealot and what his relationship was to the Jewish Nationalistic Movements. Or was he, although not a member of the Zealot party, sympathetic to the Zealot ideal, as Brandon posits? Just what was Jesus' attitude and relationship to the Jewish resistance movements of his day? Why did he not explicitly condemn the Zealots as he did the Pharisees and Sadducees, for example? We shall attempt to find answers to these and other related questions concerning Jesus' relations with the Zealots in this section.

But first we must ask: Who were the Zealots? The New Testament and extrabiblical sources make mention of five groups or parties who were operative among the Jews during the time with which we are concerned. They were the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, Herodians and the Zealots. We are here concerned only with the last group, the Zealots.

Our sources concerning the "Zealots" are not at all clear and scholars have not yet reached consensus as to the origins and nature of Zealotism in the first century A.D. The term seems to have been used very widely and inaccurately for the Jewish armed resistance movement against Rome in general. Marc Borg's warning is thus of supreme importance here (15):

"....we are not questioning the reality for which the term "zealot" is customarily used, namely widespread religiously inspired resistance to Rome. Clearly that was endemic.....(The fact that "Zealot" as party designation was restricted to the war of A.D. 66-70) in no way invalidates the major claims advanced in the recent studies of Jewish nationalism by Farmer and Hengel: it simply implies that it would be more apt to entitle them "studies of armed Jewish resistance to Rome". On the other hand, since shorthand descriptions are convenient, there is no real harm in continuing to use "zealot" so long as it is realized that its

use is prochronistic. But when accurate analysis is the object, historical precision demands that the term be used carefully". (16)

That the term "Zealot" cannot appropriately be used for various groups of patriots that resisted Roman rule is confirmed by the Jewish scholar, Solomon Zeitlin, who emphatically denies Y. Yadin's connection of Masada with the Zealots and draws a clear distinction between the Zealots and the Sicarii (17), who were the real occupants of Masada (18):

"There were two distincts groups during the revolt against the Romans - the Zealots and the Sicarii. The Zealots never took refuge in Masada - they were all the time in Jerusalem. The Sicarii were the followers of the Fourth Philosophy which was founded by Judas of Galilee in the year 6 C.E. ... The Zealots came into being in the year 66 as an opposition to the constitutional government whose members they suspected of secret dealings with the Romans. They were zealous in pursuing war to the utmost and hence were called Zealots. Their leader was Eleazar, son of Simon. ... The Sicarii had a philosophy ... their motto being that there is no lordship of man over man, and that God is the only ruler. The Zealots had no philosophy. Their sole aim was to continue vigorous per-

secution of the war". (19)

Although what Zeitlin says about the Zealots not having a philosophy cannot be accepted without qualification, because it is based on an over-simplification and lack of evidence, it remains important to keep in mind the valid distinction he draws between the Sicarii and the Zealots. Morton Smith and Marc Borg, two other scholars with specialist knowledge of our subject, agree with Zeitlin about this distinction (20). J.M.P. Sweet accepts these scholars' contention that there was not yet a Zealot party in the time of Jesus, as assumed by Brandon and the New English Bible at Mark 3:18 (21). Martin Hengel, on the other hand, insists that the "Fourth Philosophy" of Antiquities 18.23-25, founded by Judas the Galilean, was the source of the Zealot movement, with which the Sicarii and "robbers" are to be identified. He rejects any separation of the Zealots and Sicarii on the grounds that it overlooks the fact that it is inconceivable that followers of the Fourth Philosophy would call themselves "Sicarii", and further claims that this separation flows from a misunderstanding of Bell. 2.444 (22). A close reading of the text in Josephus does not allow the present writer to agree with Hengel's latter statement, and there is also no question of the "Sicarii" calling themselves by that pejorative name. They were called that by Josephus and others who despised them, which is quite understandable.

H.A. Lombard has suggested five reasons for rejecting the view that the Zealots were the only official group in the total Jewish national liberation front and that they were already operative in Jesus' time (23):

1. Josephus mentions the Zealots as an organized group for the first time in Bell. 2.444, 2.564 and 2.651. Foakes J.F. Jackson and Kirsop Lake are mistaken in stipulating that the first mention of the Zealots is in Bell. 4.160f. Likewise Brandon is wrong in holding that the first mention of Zealots is in Bell. 2.651. The historical context of these passages is the First Jewish Revolt under the leadership of Menahem.
2. Josephus' evaluation of the Zealots is extremely unfavourable and negative. He calls them *λησται* or *ληστρικοι* (bandits, brigands, murderers). For him they are rebels against both Rome and God. He accuses them of deception, of killing because their opponents were private enemies, or because they were paid to do so; of polluting and infecting Jerusalem, sowing misery and folly, looting the houses of the wealthy, murdering their owners, burning villages, and perpetrating outrages upon foreigners and Jews alike (Ant. 18.6, 25; 20.160, 165, 167-8; Bell. 2.264-5). This unfavourable judgment must be seen in the context of, first of all, the aim of his historiography, which was to glorify the Roman conquerors, Vespasian and Titus;

secondly, the negative attitude of the source used by Josephus, namely the Herodian Nicholas of Damascus; and thirdly, his family and social derivation as well as his personal conflicts with the Zealots (24).

3. This condemnation of the Zealots' liberation struggle is contrasted with the resistance of other groups. According to Josephus there was another warring party which he calls οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι and to which he himself originally belonged. They stood over against the extremist, reactionary Zealots. Furthermore Josephus contrasts the *ζελῶται* from the other extremists, οἱ σικαροί. The former is the sum total of a particular rebel party. They were responsible for the tragedy of A.D. 70. Their leader at the time of the Revolt was the priest Eleazar ben Simon. The Sicarii, on the other hand, was the "Fourth Philosophy", who under the leadership of Judas the Galilean and Zadok (or Saddu) since A.D. 6 were active as extremists and dagger murderers (of Bell. 2.118; 7.254; Ant. 8.4-10). The leader of the Sicarii at the time of the Revolt was Menahem. After Menahem's murder at the hands of the Zealots, the leadership of the Sicarii was taken over by Eleazer ben Jair, a descendent of Judas the Galilean. This group operated from Masada (Bell. 7.253). The Sicarii refused to call Caesar Lord (Bell. 2.118; Ant. 18.4-10), which is characteristic of the Fourth

Philosophy.

Another proof of the variety among the rebel groups is the fact that Bell. 2.564 refers to τοὺς ἐπ' αὐτο ζήλωτας. This implies that there were other "Zealots" also.

4. There are indeed, according to Josephus, ideological connections and common aims between the Zealots (from A.D. 66), the Sicarii (from A.D. 6), and the "Jews" (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι). However, there is no organizational and historical identity. Their modi operandi differed. (25)
5. The variety and disunity among the revolting groups is further confirmed by the murder of the leader of Sicarii, Menahem, by the Zealots. Three resistance movement existed in Jerusalem during the Revolt of A.D. 67-70, and they fought each other for control (cf. Bell. 4.10ff.; 5.1; 6.3).

The term "Zealot", then, has both a particular and a general usage. It refers to the Zealot party of Eleazar ben Simon at the time of the Jewish Revolt, in which sense the word ought to be written with a capital letter. In a general sense it is used for the various groups of militant patriots, and should be written with a lower case letter, a practice which we shall follow henceforward.

Jesus cannot have been a member of the Zealot party which came into being after his death. He did not explicitly condemn the Zealots, because as party they were non-existent during his ministry, although his warn-

ing in Matt. 26:52 (πάντες γὰρ οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀπολοῦνται) can be taken as a proleptic rejection of the zealot's option. (26)

The "zeal of God" is given in the Hebrew Old Testament as 'Iqḥ' and is translated in the LXX with θεος ζηλωτης (NEB = jealous God). Corresponding with this "zeal of God" is the "zeal" of the pious for the glory and holiness of God (cf. Ps. 119:139, LXX: ἐξετηξε με ὁ ζηλος σου, ὅτι ἐπελαθοντο των λογων σου οἱ ἐχθροι μου).

Two people whose "zeal" for God is particularly highlighted are Pinehas (Num. 25:5-13; Sirach 45:23; 1Macc. 18:12) and Elijah (1 Kings 19:10-14; Sirach 48:2; 1Macc. 2:58).

In historical and theological context, then, the "Zealot" is a person who is committed with heart and soul to God's glory and holiness, to his Law and his Kingdom. In this sense it can be an honorary title and one can imagine how perfectly it would fit Jesus.

The foregoing historical, theological and literary overview to some extent gives us an insight into the dilemma of Josephus' negative attitude towards the Zealots. Although the basic theological motivation was valid and acceptable, their methods were despicable to the historian.

In summary then: In scientific-historical perspective it is not precise to speak of a Zealot party in the time of Jesus. There was in fact a very strong Messianic oriented national awareness among the Jews.

The Jews individually and spontaneously identified themselves with these religio-political currents. The historical antecedents of these movements can be traced back to the time of the Maccabees. Their revolutionary actions were characterized by a strong zeal for the kingship of God (theocracy), the inviolability of the Law, the holiness of the Temple, and the inalienability of the land of Canaan. (27)

We can, therefore, not accept Brandon's argumentum e silentio that Josephus deliberately avoided the use of the term "Zealot" before the Jewish Revolt and that the Zealot Party was in fact in existence in the time of Jesus. Brandon's argument is here not at all convincing and is clearly illustrative of his general tendency to force the evidence to fit and demonstrate his own preconceived opinion. The references to "Zealot" in connection with Simon (Lk. 6:16) and Paul (Acts 22:3; Gal. 1:14) cannot possibly mean that they were supporters or adherents of the Zealot Party with all its malpractices. Whereas in Acts 22:3 and Gal. 1:14 (cf. also Acts 21:20; 1 Cor. 14:12; Titus 2:14; 1 Peter 3:13) the word is doubtlessly used non-technically to mean "zealous", it is unlikely that it is used in the same sense in connection with Simon the disciple. I.H. Marshall believes that the description of Simon as a Zealot is probably "meant to identify him as an erstwhile follower of the radical national group which later became the Zealots" (28). It is also true

that the technical sense of the term would be an anachronism during the time of Jesus. C. Roth's opinion that the Zealot movement was a unitary and undifferentiated movement even in Jesus' time is likewise not acceptable. Josephus for a fact distinguishes five different parties at the time of the Jewish Revolt in Jerusalem. So Morton Smith is absolutely faithful to the original text in his summary of Bell. 7.253-274:

"First, he (Josephus) insists, came the Sicarrii (254,262), who set the example of crime and cruelty; then John of Gischala went on to violation of the food laws(264), then Simon ben Giora added treachery and tyranny(265); then the Idumaeans, madness and anarchy(276); and finally the Zealots emulated every sort of evil and claimed, withal, to practice virtue(268f.). These distinctions are rhetorical and imprecise but the intention to distinguish the five parties is clear, and the passage is decisive against that identification of the Zealots and the Sicarrii for which Roth cited it" (29).

II

Now that we have looked at who the Zealots were and found that Jesus could not possibly have been a member of the party, we may put the question: Was Jesus sympathetic to the Zealot ideal? Was he a violent Messiah? What exactly was his attitude towards the Jewish resistance movement or "zealots", written with a lower case letter? How does Jesus interpret and

live out his "zeal for God's Kingdom"? What was his standpoint concerning the "zeal" of those who favoured a militant-revolutionary action for the sake of God, Law, Temple, Land, and national freedom (ἐλευθερίαν τὸν πατέρα = Ant. 17.267) or national independence (τὴν πατέρα αὐτονομίαν = Bell. 2.53)? As a Jew Jesus lived daily under Roman oppression like all his fellow Jews. Which concept and model of Messiahship did he adopt and display?

From the Old Testament and Rabbinic traditions there were two models of Messiahship: there was the violent, revolutionary, Zealotic-type like that of Judas the Galilean and Menahem; and there was the non-violent suffering-servant type of Messiahship, which constituted an other-worldly Kingdom of God without physical violence (John 18:36). The Gospels portray Jesus as the suffering-servant type Messiah, but did the historical Jesus make this choice himself or is it Gemeindetheologie? (30).

Brandon establishes from form-critical and redaction-historical considerations that Matthew and Luke in their redactional remodelling of the original Q and Markan sources carried this "pacific Christ" (suffering-servant Messiah) into the literary tradition (31). This "finding" (or is it a preconceived opinion?) is hypothetical and arbitrary and cannot be substantiated with any verifiable evidence (32). It is in fact an example of the hypothetical and tendentious nature of some of the

results of the Redactiongeschichte (33). Why could there not already have existed a "suffering-servant Messiah" conception in the historical Jesus or, for that matter, in Q or Mark?, we may well ask. Although it is conceivable that the early church could have reconstructed a pacific Christ during the first century A.D. to prove that Jesus was not a Messianic failure, it seems improbable that they would have risked it. Mark's Gospel, which presents a "pacific" Christ no less than the other Gospels, was written not so long after Jesus' death and the evangelist must have been fully aware that many Jews were still alive and some even living in Rome, who had first-hand knowledge of Jesus' person and ministry and were in a position to either verify or disprove his picture of Jesus. It is reasonable to suppose that Mark would not have taken the risk of defeating his own basic purpose to edify the Roman church by intentionally and deliberately misrepresenting the facts and so cause controversy rather than edification. J.D.G. Dunn who argues cogently and powerfully against Wrede's "Messianic Secret" hypothesis, which also posits that the Messianic character of the tradition is the result of Mark's redaction, agrees with our contention that Jesus believed himself to be Messiah in the sense of a suffering-servant type (34). Even the New Questers after the Historical Jesus admit that it is almost impossible to deny that Jesus saw his mission to some extent in

Messianic terms or that his authentic words and deeds bear an unmistakably Messianic character, although they still reject the authenticity of Messianic titles and commands to silence (35). We can then accept the traditions of the Gospels and Paul that the image of the "suffering-servant Messiah" had its roots in the activities and teachings of the historical Jesus, and that both Jesus and the early church rejected the Zealot understanding and expectation of a Messiah (36).

Before examining the passages on which Brandon builds so heavily to establish the proposed alliance of Jesus with the Zealots, which will inevitably give to our study a negative ring, we shall in our next section look at the passage (Mark 12:3-17 and parallels) which most directly and positively allows us to assess Jesus' political attitude. But before ending the present section we ought to note that Brandon's presentation of Jesus' attitude to the State made very selective use of the biblical tradition by carefully avoiding the "un-zealotic" passages. Scholars over a wide spectrum agree that Jesus' association with tax collectors to the extent that he enlisted at least one of them as a disciple, sets him off from the Zealots. His favourable words and actions towards the Samaritans would be offensive to the "national consciousness" of the Zealots, because the Samaritans were more hated than pagans (37). Even if the sayings of Jesus such as "if a man in authority makes you go one mile, go with him two Love your

enemies and pray for your persecutors" (Matt. 5:41,44), which in Jesus' time could not be said without reference to the Romans (38), were rejected as the creation of Matthew, we are still left with his un-zealotic actions mentioned above. Frank Stagg is absolutely right in his contention (39):

"Jesus' freedom from dominating, his freedom from hate and vengeance, his love for enemies, and his commitment to service, along with his association with tax gatherers and his explicit endorsement of giving back to Caesar what belongs to Caesar, clearly set him apart from the Zealots".

Add to these observations the fact of Jesus' voluntary surrender in Gethsemane and his command here that Peter put away his sword, and, as far as the present writer is concerned, Jesus' absolute innocence of Zealotic activities and ideologies is decisively proved.

Jesus rejected the sword and all that it represented, warning that those taking up the sword would "perish by the sword" (Matt. 26:52). His message of love, even for the enemy, was revolutionary indeed, but he was definitely not a Zealot and can not justly be identified with Jewish militant nationalism.

III

TRIBUTE TO CAESAR (Mark 12:13-17; Matt. 22:15-22; Luk. 20:20-26).

Mark is closely followed by Matthew and Luke in this pericope. All three Synoptics place the saying of

Jesus about tax-paying in the context of his ministry in the outer Temple court during his last week in Jerusalem. According to Mark some Pharisees and Herodians were sent to catch Jesus in an incriminating statement. Matthew has Herodians and "disciples of the Pharisees". Luke says that "spies" were sent by the scribes and chiefpriests (20:19f.) and he alone expressly states that the purpose of catching out Jesus was to deliver him "to the authority and jurisdiction of the governor" (20:20). The differences between Luke and the other two Synoptics are confined to the introductory statement (Mk 12:13; Matt. 22:15f.; Lk.20:20), and result from different ways of editing the source material. It appears in various contexts (40) that Luke has a tendency of retelling the story in a more coherent and polished style. He alone brings up the tribute question again at the trial before Pilate (23:2). As Herodians are not mentioned as conspirators in the Passion narratives, Luke does not let them play a role anywhere in the narrative that leads up to the climax of the passion, which means that the Herodians are nowhere mentioned in the whole of Luke's Gospel. The tribute question is rather connected to the chief opponents of Jesus in Luke's story, the scribes and Pharisees. I.H. Marshall makes the further good suggestion that Luke dropped the description that the deputation was made up of Pharisees and Herodians, either because the latter group was no longer signi-

ficant or because an association of the two groups seemed unlikely to him (41).

The pericope is categorized by form critics as an apophthegm or paradigm (pronouncement story) which was related for the sake of the punchline, "Render to Caesar....." The historicity of the incident, apart from the editorial introduction, is widely accepted by scholars. Rudolf Bultman insists that there is no reason to suppose that the story is a community product and says further that the saying cannot have circulated on its own, because it is only intelligible as part of the pericope (42). F.F. Bruce correctly rejects the unconvincing argument of B.S. Eaton that our pericope (Mk. 12:13-17) in Mark's source must have followed continuously on the five controversies of Mark 2:1 to 3:6, which mention an alliance between Pharisees and Herodians (3:6). Bruce argues that whereas the group of five controversies has a Galilean setting (cf. 2:1), our pericope clearly presupposes a Judean context (43):

"It was in Judea, not Galilee, that the tribute question was one of the practical moment, with the risk of an impolitic answer being construed as seditious.

The presence of Herodians here is not surprising if Herod Antipas was temporarily resident in Jerusalem (cf. Luke 23:7)".

D.R. Griffiths and Sherwin-White also comment on the appropriateness of the story being set in the Roman province of Judea, where the taxes would be collected directly for the imperial treasury. "Render unto

Caesar....." would therefore have a literal meaning in Judea (44).

The "oily preamble" of cajolery with which Jesus' questioners attempt to trap him was probably aimed at attracting an eager crowd of listeners in order to put Jesus publicly on the spot. It does tell us that Jesus impressed people as a fearless, truthful, and impartial person who would not adapt his answer to the preferences of his hearers.

The question, *ἐξεστὶν δοῦναι κῆνσον (φόρον) καίσαρι ἢ οὐ;* (45), is a calculated attempt to catch Jesus on the horns of a dilemma: If Jesus answered the question whether it is lawful to pay tribute to Caesar in the affirmative he would probably lose a great deal of popular support by appearing disloyal to the Jewish cause. If he answered in the negative he would embroil himself with the Roman authorities.

The question was a highly controversial one among the Jews. According to Bruce the secular and religious taxation could have been in the region of forty per cent of the provincial income (46). Apart from this, due to the influence of the "Fourth Philosophy", payment of tribute to Rome was widely regarded as incompatible with Israel's theocratic ideals. After all, no religious objections seem to have been voiced against payment of taxes to Jewish rulers (47). Many Jews would resent the payment of tribute to Rome on patriotic and economic grounds, and the doctrine that it was impious

to pay tribute to the pagan Caesar must have been very popular. Even those who continued to pay it reluctantly must have admired their fellow-countrymen who, on the courage of their conviction, endured the Roman punishment for not acknowledging Caesar's sovereignty and right to tax them (48). With such popular sympathies engaged on the subject it was on no purely academic point of legal interpretation that Jesus was asked to give a ruling. This point is illustrated by the fact that the revolt of Judas in A.D. 6 was connected with a census for levying pole tax.

One can easily imagine that the Sadducees, who in general collaborated with the Romans, would favour the payment of tribute. The Pharisees would have divided opinions on the question. The majority would have submitted to the payment, regarding the Roman dominion as a necessary evil (49), while those Pharisees who were influenced by the "Fourth Philosophy" would have taken the view that the paying of tribute to a pagan Empire was an offence against the idea of Israel as a theocracy. The Herodians were not a religious party but promoted the interests of the Herodian dynasty, hoping probably for the re-integration of Herod's kingdom under one of his descendants. Although they strove for the end of government by imperial procurators, their policy must have been pro-Roman, because it was only as allies or vassals of Rome that the Herods could exercise any authority in Palestine (50). It is con-

ceivable that they would favour a system whereby taxes would be collected by the Herodian dynasty, who would in their turn pay a percentage to the Emperor as the case was from 37 to 4 B.C. (51). As far as the "zealots" were concerned, Jesus' answer would show where he stood on this question which for them was all-important.

"Is it lawful", they asked (meaning, is it permissible in terms of Mosaic law), "to give tribute to Caesar or not?" Jesus' reply, "Bring me a dinarius; let me see it", affirms the fact, attested elsewhere (52), that the Roman tribute was to be paid in Roman money. Jesus held up the coin and asked his questioners whose image and name was inscribed on it. If the coin has been issued by the current emperor, as can well be imagined, "it would be a silver coin, bearing on one side the head of the emperor wearing a laurel wreath and the words "Ti. Caesar Divi Aug. F. Augustus" (Tiberius Caesar, son of the deified Augustus, Augustus), and on the other side the figure of the emperor's mother Livia as an earthly incarnation of the goddess Pax with the words "Pontifex Maximus" (high priest)"(53). The coin symbolised the power of the emperor and made claims for him that the Jews considered blasphemous (54). The very fact that the questioners in our story presumably handled and gazed at the coin makes it unlikely that the religious sentiments of those who felt strongly about the blasphemy represented by money played an important role in the question about the tribute (55).

The answer of Jesus astounded his hearers for its cleverness, reducing his opponents to silence, and giving them no grounds for denouncing him to the governor on a charge of political insurrection (Mk. 12:17; Matt. 22:22; Lk.20:26). This is how he said it:

τὰ Καίσαρος ἀποδοτε Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ.

Jesus' answer is not as self-explanatory as it may at first appear, as can be seen in the numerous different interpretations that have been given to it. J.D.M. Derrett provides a specially full bibliography and a valuable outline of the positions taken in the interpretation of Jesus' reply (56). D.R. Griffiths discusses what he thinks are the four most important lines of interpretation (57). The present writer shall not go into a detailed discussion of any of these views, but shall simply put forward his own view of what the most likely meaning of Jesus' answer is. The first point of significance in Jesus' answer is that he changes the colourless δῶμεν of his questioners into ἀπόδοτε.

Jesus' verb, ἀπόδιδωμι, although it can simply mean "to pay" and is used generally of payments (58), is likely to have in this context its natural meaning of "handing back", "returning", "refunding", "repaying" (59). Jesus' answer implies, therefore, that money demanded by Caesar by way of taxation in some sense belonged to Caesar anyway. It bore Caesar's εἰκὼν and ἐπιγραφή. Granted that money belongs to the person who possesses it (60), there is a sense in which it expresses the lordship of

the person whose claims to rule are expressed on it, and this is the real point at issue (61). Caesar is the de facto ruler and inherent in this fact is his right to tax his subjects. No state can exist without the payment of taxes and Caesar provided as well as prescribed the means by which his taxes should be paid. Jesus in his reply uses ἀποδίδωμι to stress the fact that the Roman subjects had an inescapable political responsibility, an obligation, to give or pay back something which they owed as a debt (62). The evangelist John (19:11) attributes to Jesus knowledge of the idea which was familiar to the Jews (Jer. 27:5f; Dan. 2:21, 37f.; 4:17; Wisdom 6:3; 1 Enoch 46:5) that the king's power to rule derives from God. I.H. Marshall is also correct in suggesting that Jesus' τὰ Καίσαρος goes beyond the payment of taxes and refers to rendering to the ruler whatever he may lawfully prescribe (63). Jesus then not only advises the payment of taxes, but goes beyond the question of his opponents by asserting that the taxes they pay ought to be regarded as a goodwill gift they offer to Caesar, but a repayment of what they owe the sovereign for benefits derived from him. The very fact that they were using Caesar's coins proved that they took advantage of the amenities provided by him (64). Along with the tax they are also under a moral obligation to submit to the authority of the State in general, a principle which is repeated in Rom. 13:1-7 and 1 Pet. 2:13-17. Jesus' answer then goes

further by commanding them to give God what belongs to God. Various interpretations have been given to the things Jesus probably saw as belonging to God. The content of τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ has been given as the Temple-tax, the Land of Israel and its produce, worship, and obedience (65). The most interesting of these, with which we cannot fully agree, is that of Derrett, who asserts that Jesus meant that by giving Caesar what was his would be giving God what was God's. According to this, other ways of putting Jesus' statement would be "Obey the commands of Caesar and obey thereby the commandments of God", or "Obey the commands of the king provided that the commandments of God are not broken in your doing so" (66). The two ways in which Derrett puts Jesus' injunction in our previous sentence differ radically from each other. The first alternative makes Caesar almost equivalent with God. The second alternative is logically more acceptable but still does not do full justice to Jesus' actual words. Derrett regards Jesus' standpoint as based on Eccles. 8:2: "Keep the king's command", which Jesus appealed to because nothing else in the Torah is quite so explicit (67). The words of Eccles. 8:2 are literally rendered, "watch the king's mouth", which Derrett relates to the unusual expression in Mark 12:14, "you do not look at the face of men". Although interesting, Derrett's interpretation is forced, unconvincing and it does not contribute positively to our understanding of Jesus' meaning. We can state with

a great measure of confidence that what Jesus probably had in mind was that $\tau\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ are one's whole life, one's total obedience and individed worship and commitment. What Jesus' answer implies is, "the coin belongs to Caesar, but you to God" (68).

It is further important to note that although the sentence "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's" is a parallelism, it does not imply that Jesus was giving equal significance to the two sections. The very fact that Jesus did not limit himself to an answer on the rights of Caesar, but introduced a further assertion on the claims of God, implies that the latter carries the greater significance. It is as if Jesus was saying, "Render to Caesar what is his, but do not forget that there is something infinitely more important, namely that you should give God what belongs to God". This conclusion is re-inforced by what Jesus teaches in other parts of the Gospels, for example, Matt. 10:28 ("Do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul ; rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell"), and John 19:11 ("Jesus answered Pilate, 'You would have no power over me unless it had been given you from above'.). Caesar, the representative of the State, is not equal to God, but is appointed by God.

For some scholars the emphasis is so clearly on the second clause of Jesus' reply that they take the sentence as an instance of "ironical parallelism". Martin

Dibelius, for instance, comments as follows:

"So when Jesus says, "give the emperor what belongs to him - look at it and see....and give God what is his", this is an ironical parallelism. That ought not to need demonstration! It did not occur to place the rights of the emperor seriously on the same level as those of God" (69).

Whether or not the idea of an ironical undertone to the saying is accepted, one must agree with the fact that in Jesus' reply the rights of Caesar are limited and subordinate to those of God, and that which is God's must not be given to Caesar, namely worship, unquestioning obedience, all of one's life.

Jesus' attitude as portrayed by Mk. 12:13-17 would seem to be that the State, represented by Caesar, received its power "from above", from God, and has therefore a right to demand respect, obedience, and support from its subjects, the things needed for its continued existence. This acknowledgement of the State's right to exist in no way makes it equal to God or the religious sphere. The nowadays often repeated fallacy that religion has nothing to do or to say to politics, as if the two spheres are mutually exclusive, autonomous and equal entities, is disproved by the second half of Jesus' saying which affirms the prior and all inclusive claims of God. God remains the ultimate sovereign who sets up and deposes kings and what is God's, namely the total person, total obedience and worship, must not be

given to the State. The second half of Jesus' statement also opens the way for civil disobedience. As soon as the State starts demanding things that are God's or are contrary to God's revealed will, the child of God is under obligation to God to resist and disobey such demands. This puts on the Christian and the Church the obligation to remain critical of the State's demands and performance in the light of God's requirements for justice. Jesus himself set an example for his followers in his reply to the cunning Herod in Luke 13:31-33, when he refused to interrupt his ministry because he had offended Herod. James Moulder also points to Jesus' refusal to answer Herod and Pilate's questions during the trial(s) and his critical attitude to those who governed in Mark 10:42-45 as examples which negate the "total obedience thesis" (70). There are definite limits to the Christians obedience to the State. "Civil disobedience" or "non-violent resistance" are the terms used today for the refusal of the claims made by the State, as Christians answer to the higher claim of God as understood by conscience (71).

Another way of interpreting Jesus' reply to the tribute-question is to see it as his emphatic rejection of the three major options open to him as dictated by the Essenes, the Sadducees and the Zealots (72). The Sadducean option of willing subordination and total obedience to the Roman state is clearly rejected by Jesus' affirmation of the prior claims of God (73). The Essene

withdrawal from the corrupted temple and from sinful society, awaiting a messianic intervention of priestly and military dimensions, was another strong option which Jesus rejected both by his anti-ascetic lifestyle, and his command that his hearers remain responsibly in the world: "Render to Caesar what belongs to Caesar....". This reply is also a rejection of the zealot option which involved denial of obligations to Caesar.

In Jesus' view the State had an undeniable place, but remained subordinate to God. A further theological implication of this is that the Church has the prophetic task of speaking God's word to Caesar.

IV

In this section we shall look at the trial of Jesus to see what light it can shed on Jesus' attitude to the State. Jesus was condemned by Pilate to the Roman form of execution for sedition, as "King of the Jews"; in other words, as a national resistance leader who denied the kingship of Caesar (73). Although the Gospels contain many minor differences in narrative which are difficult to harmonize neatly, all four of them agree in the essential framework that action was taken against Jesus by the Jewish hierarchy who then used the Roman governor to achieve their aim of having Jesus killed. Jesus died on the cross as a Messianic pretender (understood by the Romans in political terms as a kingly pretender) and therefore as a potential menace to the pu-

blic order. The titulus, "King of the Jews", is irrefutable evidence of the political nature of the decisive accusation against Jesus. Scholars in both of the major schools of interpretation agree that this is the way in which the Gospels present Jesus' trial (74). The ways, however, separate on the question whether the condemnation was justified, whether Jesus was in fact innocent of the charge, as the Gospels have it. In other words, scholars of the Reimarus school of thought find it impossible to accept the gospel presentation as a true presentation of the political aspirations (or non-aspirations) of the historical Jesus. As far as most of them are concerned Jesus' death was primarily the result of Roman police action against the seditions and teachings of Jesus.

The first point about which widespread controversy rages is the presentation of the gospels of the Jewish authorities as the "prime movers" in the arrest of Jesus. It is of considerable importance for the task we have set ourselves that we establish as accurately as possible who had him arrested and for what reason(s). From the gospels it is clear that much of the teaching of Jesus had been offensive to the Pharisees, as the "controversy stories" show. Griffiths believes that the "cleansing" of the Temple brought this animosity to a climax. It so affronted the Sadducaic high priesthood that they ordered his arrest (75).

Brandon, who is as tendentious as he makes out the

Evangelists to be, does not consider texts such as Acts 2:23; 2:36; 3:13; 10:39, which allude to the Pharisaic animosity as the motivation for the arrest of Jesus. The early text, 1 Thes. 2:14f.(76), which upholds Jewish initiative in the arrest, is characteristically brushed aside by Brandon on the grounds that it is vague and not genuine (77).

It is difficult to accept that the strong animosity of the Pharisees based on religious differences and Jesus' critical attitude towards them, could in itself lead to the drastic action taken against the Nazarene. The suspicion that the theological charge brought against Jesus had an underlying political motivation, has led scholars recently to take a fresh look at the socio-political structures of Jesus' day in an attempts to get a more coherent picture of the forces at work in his trial and death. The fact that Jesus died as a political activist who was viewed as a threat to public peace and order by both the Jewish elite and the Roman authorities of his day, makes the type of questions asked by these scholars imperative and of utmost importance. George V. Pixley's social reading of the Gospels led him to propose that Jesus set out to give a new embodiment to the Kingdom of God by overthrowing the priestly temple system and its ideology that masked the combined oppression of the Roman and Jewish elite against the great majority of Palestinian Jews. Jesus' non-violence was an important part of his strategy to

neutralize Roman power while attacking the domestic Jewish religious and economic establishment and his teachings on love and forgiveness were directed at his followers in an attempt to develop a disciplined and internally peaceful movement. The first stage in Jesus' strategy was to move about Galilee with a core band of followers in order to recruit people for his revolutionary project, in the course of which he awakened opposition from local religious establishments. Moving to Jerusalem, he disrupted the temple economy, but he was untimely executed by an agreement between Jewish and Roman authorities when his popular support crumbled. His abrupt death prevents us from knowing how he might have consolidated popular support had he been able to close down the temple, or what his strategy toward Rome would have been. The organizational principles of Jesus were equality among his supporters and the surrender of wealth and family. The allied enemies of Jesus and his movement were able to undermine his popular support because so many people in Palestine depended on the temple economy for a livelihood or had become *psychologically* and culturally dependent upon it for national identity. The specifics of Jesus' historical project cannot be absolutized by Christians, nor can his nonviolence be treated as a universal ethical norm, firstly because it failed, and secondly because violence may not necessarily have been excluded once Jesus' strategy reached the stage of

direct confrontation with the Romans (78).

Pixley's proposal is remarkably coherent, but remains largely hypothetical, as he himself admits (79). In the course of his reconstruction he makes the unfortunate mistake of extending the name "Zealot" backwards to cover the whole Jewish resistance movement, but he at least recognizes Jesus' non-violence and rejection of the violent option. Pixley also provided New Testament scholarship with invaluable information on how the temple economy under the administration of the Jewish elite interlocked with the slave economy of Rome. It is clear that much more work needs to be done in this respect. The worth and viability of a hypothesis such as Pixley's can only be assessed in terms of how well it answers the questions raised by the existing tradition. The present writer feels that Pixley's hypothesis is still of doubtful cogency and that it does, for instance, not explain why Jesus did not attempt to flee from his enemies if his revolutionary project was incomplete. It also does not explain why Jesus alone, and not his closest disciples also, was executed by the Romans. He does attribute to the Twelve full knowledge and support of Jesus' revolutionary program. These accomplices were "given the secret of the kingdom of God" and they were in such complete solidarity with the undertaking that the group broke up into teams of two "to cover a larger territory" (80). It seems unlikely that the potential danger of the dis-

ciples' continuation of the revolutionary project would have been overlooked by the wary opponents. We must conclude that Pixley's proposal will have to undergo considerable alteration in the light of further study before it can be seriously considered as a viable reconstruction of Jesus' historical project.

C.A. Wanamaker is much more cautious in his attempt to explain the motivation behind Jesus' arrest and crucifixion (81). He combines the traditional historical criticism and the sociological approach to reach a position which to a large extent overlaps with that of Pixley without going quite as far as the latter. Because Jesus undoubtedly sought the transformation of Judaism, Wanamaker believes that Jesus' programme can only be understood in terms of either a peaceful revolution or potentially violent revolution (82). For him Jesus undermined the socio-political and religious structures of his day in the same way as John the Baptist did, namely by rejecting the existing social and religious structures by which the power elite exploited and oppressed their fellow Israelites. Jesus expected imminent divine judgment and a new socio-political order. When Jesus began to proclaim that the long expected eschatological time (the Kingdom of God predicted by Isaiah 52) had arrived and that the people of Israel should respond by repentance and acceptance of the good tidings of these things, he also, as agent of God, began his healing ministry to coincide with the

dawning of the new order of social justice, religious renewal and shalom. This healing activity led to the hostility of Herod and the religious elite because it caused Jesus to be recognized as a prophetic figure by the masses:

"Claiming to be God's agent and deriving his authority directly from God he challenged the validity of the authority of the religious establishment of his day (which we must never forget was also a part of the socio-economic and political establishment) by proclaiming that a new age was emerging. The people perceiving that Jesus had direct authority from God saw that the divine origin of his message regarding the Kingdom of God was confirmed by his exorcisms and healings (see Mark 1:21-28). This in turn led to a wide following among those for whom the Kingdom of God represented a long desired eschatological goal which would free them from their existing conditions of poverty, oppression, and anomie at the hands of Rome and her minions " (83).

Jesus offered to the social outcasts (sinners), the am ha-aretz, and the very poor, redemption through integration in a new and restored people of God based on repentance, trust and acceptance of God's rule over their lives, without requiring obedience to a rigid system of commandments or participation in the corrupt cultic life which the Sadducees used to their own

financial advantage. The Jewish religious elite could not compete with Jesus' direct offer of salvation to all, which was affirmed by his miraculous powers, and sought ways to undermine and eliminate him. In this their interests coalesced with the political interests of Herod Antipas who feared an uprising which would lead to Roman intervention and his own political demise, which explains why Herodians and Pharisees plotted together against Jesus. Jesus' visit to Jerusalem which was, according to Wanamaker, probably intended to be his final showdown with the religious and political elite of the Jews, led to his death.

The greatest strength of Wanamaker's argument lies in the fact that he does not propose any far-fetched hypotheses, but rather seeks to strengthen, reinforce and lend a solid basis to the animosity of the religious elite which is posited by the Gospels. His psychological analysis in connection with the exorcisms is not very plausible, but the essential cogency of his arguments is not diminished thereby. If we accept that the theological charge of blasphemy had the underlying political motivation which Wanamaker argues for, as the present writer feels that we must, the Jewish elite regarded Jesus as a threat to their political, social and economic position. His popularity with the masses who regarded him as a prophet and possibly the long awaited Messiah had the potential of sparking off a war against Rome or a social revolution within Judaism which

would bring to an end the privileges they enjoyed.

Oscar Cullmann's view of Jesus' arrest that "From the beginning the entire actions proceeds from the Romans" is totally mistaken (84). So also is Griffiths' contention that the *σπεῖρα* in John 18:3, 12 is used for a "cohort" of Roman soldiers (85). W.F. Howard's suggestion that Roman soldiers may have been provided on request to support the temple police is also unacceptable (86). C.K. Barrett correctly questions the presence of Roman soldiers at the arrest:

"The participation of Roman forces at this stage of the proceedings against Jesus seems improbable, since the first step was apparently for the Jews to frame a charge that might be brought to the Governor, and Roman soldiers would have taken Jesus at once to Pilate" (87).

On the questions of a Roman presence at Jesus' arrest we can take David R. Catchpole's findings as decisive (88). Only John's Gospel mentions soldiers at the arrest, and the terms it uses (Jn. 18:3, 12), *σπεῖρα* and *Χιλιάρχος*, are neutral terms which do not indicate a Roman party at all. These terms would have to be prefaced by *ἡ Ῥωμαϊκή* or *ὁ Ῥωμαϊκός* respectively to indicate Roman soldiers, as is the case in Bell. 2.224 and 5.244. Catchpole further puts forward the following cogent arguments against a Roman presence at the arrest.

(a) The *πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ* of Mark 14:49 (cf. Matt. 26:55;

and Lk. 22:53) fits only if Jesus was addressing Jews in general, or the temple police in particular, but not if his hearers were Romans (89). (b) It is unlikely that Judas, especially if Iscariot stems from the sicarrii idea, as Cullmann and others posit, would have betrayed Jesus to the Romans and actively co-operated with them. (c) The failure to arrest Peter after using the sword is incomprehensible if Romans were acting against a supposed zealot threat, but it is conceivable if Jesus alone was the target for Jewish objection. (d) John 18:4-11 probably represents the Evangelist's interpretation of the event, and the retreat before the divine Name, although theological in conception rather than historical, suggests that the evangelist interpreted his material in the sense of a Jewish audience. The strong probability that the arrest party was exclusively Jewish is in no way weakened by John 18:12 where σπεῖρα and χιλιάρχος are distinguished from οἱ ὑπηρέται των Ἰουδαίων, for οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι is not so much an ethnic term in much of John as a description of the Jerusalem authorities, particularly when they range themselves against Jesus. According to Blinzler ὑπηρέται represents legal officers attached specifically to the Sanhedrin (90). Nor does the fact that the arrest party was armed constitute an objection to our contention that the arrest was executed exclusively by Jews, as it is widely attested that the carrying of weapons for self-protection was permitted and would

logically also be carried by the temple police (91).

We can take it as proven, then, that Jesus was arrested by the Temple police, a fact which has significance for our contention that the primary motive for the charge against Jesus was initially religious (with the economic and socio-political motives outlined by Wanamaker still covered up) rather than political. We are unable to support the contention of those scholars who argue that the Synoptics deliberately, for apologetic reasons, minimized the participation of the Romans in the arrest and trial of Jesus.

Once we have accepted the essential historicity of the gospel framework argued cogently for by Catchpole, Schubert, and others (92), we can consider the charges the Jews brought against Jesus before the Sanhedrin to see whether these shed any light on the Nazarene's political attitude. The proceedings described in Mark 14:55-64 (=Matt. 26:57-68; Lk. 22:54-71; Jn. 18:13-24) seem to have been a preliminary inquiry held with a view to the formulation of a charge to bring before Pilate, rather than a real trial (93). Cranfield suggests that the production of religious charges (the "destruction" of the Temple and the "blasphemy" charge) is to be explained by the desire of the Jewish leaders to carry as many as possible of the Sanhedrin with them in their ultimate intention to have him killed:

"Evidence of disrespect for the Temple or blasphemy could be more likely to unite them than

evidence of a possible threat to the Roman power. Having once got the members to agree that Jesus deserved to die as a blasphemer, the High Priest presumably then obtained agreement that they should actually proceed before Pilate with a political charge " (94).

K. Schubert's observation that Mark 14:55-64 is to be understood from the supposition that the Jerusalem priestly nobility felt themselves imperilled by Jesus' criticism of the Temple in the sphere which was above all their own (95), still fails to take cognizance of the vested interest the priestly elite had in the Temple economy. This factor must have been the dominant one and was probably used by the elite to turn the multitude, a large part of which depended on the Temple for their livelihood, against Jesus (96). This fear of the priestly nobility is unlikely to have existed in relation to the possibility that Jesus was able with the help of his followers to physically break down the Temple, but rather that his negative attitude may have led to a general disrespect for the Temple and a substantial drop in business and financial turnover (97).

Although many charges are supposed to have been brought against Jesus according to Mark 14:55-6 (=Matt. 26:59-60), only one is expressly mentioned, namely the one concerning the destruction of the Temple. In the light of that part of Pixley's thesis that we

accept, namely that Jesus attacked the corrupt Temple and the class structure which it supported (98), this issue must have played such a prominent role in the Sanhedrin inquiry that of all the "false charges" only this one was preserved in the tradition. This would be the decisive point for the Jerusalem priestly establishment on which they could prove that Jesus was a subversive character. Brandon's inference from Mark 13:2 that Jesus alluded to actions of his own against the Temple and that his hostility to the Temple of necessity makes him a sympathizer with the anti-Roman revolutionary movements who also directed themselves against the Roman collaborators among the priestly nobility (99), must be rejected. Pixley correctly observes that the "Zealots" acknowledged the privileged place of the Temple, and therefore of the hierocratic class society (100). K. Schubert, who himself adheres to the traditional view that Jesus was foretelling the destruction of the Temple during the Jewish Revolt, correctly observes that Jesus' speaking against the Temple implies neither sympathy with the anti-Roman resistance movements nor an active personal share in the destruction. He quotes as an example how Johanan ben Zacchai, a Roman collaborator in the Jewish Revolt of A.D. 66-73, spoke against the Temple without entertaining any sympathy for the rebels (101).

David Flusser finds it possible that the Temple priesthood may have taken Jesus' words to im-

ply action of his own:

"It is in the highest degree probable that, when Jesus was examined by the High Priest, the first question was whether he had in fact uttered the saying against the temple.....It seems to me to follow from the accounts in the Gospels that the proclamation of the temple destruction was for the High Priests real ground for handing Jesus over to Pilate " (102).

It is doubtful that "the first question" in the Sanhedrin hearing was about the temple destruction. The first two Gospels only mention this question after "many false witnesses" failed to bring forward a coherent accusation (Mark 14:56; Matt. 26:60)(103). Neither do the Gospels give the impression that the "destruction" question provided the basis for the final verdict. The witnesses differed in their evidence and were disqualified. All three of the Synoptics portray the High Priest as passing from this question, after failing to get any response from Jesus, to the one about his Messiahship and this latter issue gave rise to the "blasphemy" charge which was raised before Pilate. Even so, the High Priest probably hoped during this interrogation that Jesus would say something incriminating concerning his alleged hostility towards the Temple which would unite the Sanhedrin against him and which they could use as a charge before Pilate. This important allegation deserves our closer attention: Jesus must at some time have said

something concerning the Temple which was possible to be misunderstood or misconstrued by his hearers and gave rise to the allegation before the Sanhedrin. Since the Evangelists are all at pains to deal with this pronouncement concerning the Temple in one way or another, it seems likely that it both held a very secure place in the tradition and went back in some form to Jesus himself.

According to Mark 14:58/ Matt. 26:61 it is the false witnesses who claim that Jesus "threatened" to destroy the temple and rebuild it in three days (104). According to John 2:19 Jesus, at the "cleansing" of the Temple, challenged his hearers to destroy the Temple and he would rebuild it in three days: *λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν.*

John goes on to theologize that Jesus spoke of his body as the Temple. According to Mark 13:1,2 (Matt. 24:1f., Lk. 21:5f) Jesus did at some stage make a prediction about the destruction of the temple. In response to a remark from his disciples about the splendour of the Temple, Jesus replied:

"Do you see these great buildings? There will not be left here one stone upon another". (Mark 13:2; Matt. 24.2; Lk. 21:6).

We may note a number of things in connection with this saying. No mention is made of a "rebuilding" which is inherent in the "destruction" motif of the Passion narratives and Acts 6:14. Luke and Matthew probably used Mark in this saying. John, apparently dependent on

Mark 14:56, places the saying of Jesus about destruction and rebuilding of the Temple in the context of the "cleansing" of the Temple (Jn. 2:19). C.K. Barrett calls it:

".....a very striking example of the way in which John collects scattered synoptic material and synoptic themes, welds them into a whole, and uses them to bring unmistakably the true(sic) meaning of the synoptic presentation of Jesus" (105).

As "rebuilding" is not mentioned in Mark 13:1f. (=Matt. 24:1f.; Lk. 21:5f.) the allegation at the Sanhedrin trial may not at all refer to that saying of Jesus, and it ought to be interpreted independently of the "destroy and rebuild"-saying of the trial. As such it has traditionally been taken as a "genuine prophecy" (not a vaticinium ex eventu one) of the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70 (106). It may also have been a reference to more than just the physical, material Temple-structure, but to the old order of exploitation and the class structure with its accompanying cultic practices which the Temple symbolized, so that what Jesus actually meant was, "If the religious leaders continue in their present practices, they will sooner or later bring upon themselves and the Temple the wrath of God and see the destruction of the whole system".

The Sanhedrin trial narratives probably recollected a saying of Jesus concerning the Temple's destruction and rebuilding which is not elsewhere recorded in our

extant tradition. We note that in Acts 6:14 and Mark 15:29 a similar saying is alluded to. Cranfield agrees with our contention that an actual saying of Jesus, which is probably distinct from Mark 13:2, lies behind the accusation before the Sanhedrin (107). The original form of the saying cannot be established with certainty. Cranfield finds it possible that the original saying concerned the destruction of the Temple and its replacement by the new Temple of the last times, referred to by 1 Enoch 90:28f; or a prediction of the death and resurrection of Jesus, couched in the form of a māsāl. Vincent Taylor correctly observes that in itself the saying about destruction and rebuilding of the Temple does not necessarily refer to the Resurrection, "although this interpretation lies near at hand and is made in John 2:21f." (108). It is not impossible that the saying as it came from the mouth of the historical Jesus, expressed his judgment of the Old Order of which the Temple was the symbol and centre, and Jesus' vision and hope for a new spiritual and socio-economic system or community based on justice. In terms of our stated supposition that Jesus sought the transformation of Judaism. Jesus would then have said something like, "This Temple (meaning, this order of exploitation, oppression and injustice) will be (or, is bound to be) destroyed and I (the Son of Man) shall raise it (a new order) up in a short while" (109). This suggestion is conjectural, of course, and is offered very tentative-

ly, but we should admit that it is at least a possibility. It is also possible to see the High Priest's question about Jesus' alleged Temple pronouncement as a roundabout way of finding out whether he claimed to be the Messiah. Messiahship was implicit in the idea of rebuilding a new Temple (110), so that there existed a definite link between the two decisive questions before the Sanhedrin, on the one hand, and between the issues before the Sanhedrin and before Pilate, on the other hand. Following Kilpatrick and Blinzler, David Catchpole believes that speaking against the Temple, as Jesus was alleged to have done, would indeed be considered a blasphemy (111), but the fact that this charge failed and was apparently not the direct reason for Jesus' condemnation makes it less important than the consequent direct question about his Messiahship.

"Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" of Mark 14:62 is rendered by Matt. 26:63 as follows: "I adjure you by the living God, tell us if you are the Christ, the Son of God?". Luke separates the two parts of the question. In Lk. 22:67 the High Priest asks, "If you are the Christ, tell us", and three verses later (22:70) the seeming parallelism is drawn, "Are you the Son of God then?". John constantly portrays the Jews as seeking to kill Jesus because he was "making himself" the Son of God (Jn. 5:57-59; 10:25-33; 19:7). The expression "Son of God" seems to have been used in the sense of Messiah already in Psalm 2:6, and in Matt. 16:16.

The three interpretational groups concerning the coupling of the two titles into which Catchpole divides the Jewish scholars whom he studies, are also applicable to non-Jewish scholars, although many variations are found in the exposition of each view. These are: (a) the two titles express two separate charges; (b) Messiahship is absorbed into the transcendence presumed to be inherent in the Son of God title, so that Messiahship itself becomes superhuman in character; (c) the Son of God title is only a title of the entirely human Messiah. This third position is also reached by those who regard the words "Son of God" as an anachronistic parallelism (112).

After giving an extensive critique of the arguments of the most important scholars in each of the positions, which we shall not repeat here, Catchpole places himself in the first group who treats the two titles as separate charges. He examines five issues which might possibly have led to the "blasphemy" charge of the Sanhedrin; namely, Jesus' speaking against the Temple, the claim to be Messiah, the "assumption" of the Divine Name by his use of ἐγώ εἰμι (=Ani Hu), his "self-exaltation" as the enthroned Son of Man, and the claim to be Son of God (113). He finds that the claim to be Son of God most probably constituted the "blasphemy" (114).

For J.C. O'Neill there is no doubt that there were various religious, social and political reasons for the Jewish leaders' decision that Jesus was guilty of a

capital crime deserving death (reasons that were not produced in court), but that the Sanhedrin hearing was set up for the purpose of producing a legal charge to bring before Pilate (115). O'Neill, who differs from Catchpole in that he holds that "Son of God" was an acceptable messianic designation (which puts him in the third group of scholars mentioned earlier on) argues that the "blasphemy" was committed when Jesus encroached on God's prerogative of making the Messianic announcement himself. The charge was probably false, but the Sanhedrin would regard Jesus' defence as a mere technicality. According to O'Neill John 19:7, together with Matt. 11:2-6; Mark 10:40; Ps. Sol. 17:22 and the saying in Matt. 11:27 = Luke 10:22 (when the secondary gloss, "No one knows the Son save the Father" is removed from the latter saying), must be understood in terms of God's exclusive right to reveal the identity of the Messiah, and the consequent presumption and blasphemy of any man's anticipating the divine decision and claiming this dignity for himself in advance (116). Against this can be argued that, (a) John 19:7 does not indicate that Messianic ideas are connected with this reference to Sonship; (b) it is difficult to understand O'Neill's argument that "No-one knows the Son save the Father" is a gloss and that this very statement that ought to be deleted contains the basis of his hypothesis that only God can reveal the identity of the Messiah; (c) the statement in Ps. Sol. 17:22 that God

knows the time when his Messiah will be raised is not the same as the view that a man must wait for God before claiming to be Messiah; (d) in terms of O'Neill's hypothesis the οὐ λέγεις in Mark 15:2 would have to be interpreted as evasive, something which Catchpole shows is unlikely (117). The second position, namely a transcendent Messiahship, is argued for by K. Schubert (118). Whereas Catchpole was able to separate the Messiahship and "Son of God" issues on the basis of his supposition that Luke is following a separate and historically more genuine tradition than Mark at this specific point and therefore concluded that the "Son of God" affirmation of Jesus was "blasphemy", Schubert argues strongly for the historical soundness of Mark's report:

"It is in the highest degree probable that this decisive question of the high priest is verbally reproduced here through the mediacy of an ear-witness, and that we have, so to say, ipsissima vox of the high priest!" (119).

Schubert sees the whole of the Sanhedrin hearing as being concerned with the question of Messiahship. When the high priest failed to win from Jesus an expression of a viewpoint concerning his alleged messianic rebuilding of the Temple, he could do no other than pose the messianic question in so many words, the Messiah being a synonomic parallel of "Son of God" in an adopted sense (120). Jesus' reply which is expanded by the Son of Man citation from Daniel 7:13 and Psalm 110:1 is

likewise an affirmation that he is the Messiah. Schubert goes on to cite texts from Ps. Solomon, the Qumran Manual of Discipline and the Similitudes of Enoch (121) which for him prove that the Son of Man was equated with the Davidic Messiah from the first Century B.C.

Schubert's contention that the Jewish Messiah was a divine and transcendent figure is by no means decisive and is contested by most scholars, Jewish as well as non-Jewish. And even if a transcendent Messiah had a Jewish background, the question still remains why a Messianic claim should constitute a crime in Jesus' case. Claims to Messiahship are normally regarded as non-criminal, according to Jewish scholars such as I. Mattuck and S. Zeitlin (122), while Montefiore saw a Messianic claim a bone of contention with all groups, since Sadducees feared the political menace and Pharisees took note of the implied criticism of the Law (123).

As far as Jesus' reply is concerned, whether Mark's *ἐγὼ εἰμι* (14:62) was originally *οὐ εἶπας ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι* or not, the fact remains that the Sanhedrin took it as affirmative. What is of more immediate importance for our present purposes is Jesus' reference to the Son of Man. Oscar Cullmann and J.D.G. Dunn have both presented strong arguments for the fact that Jesus' understanding of Messiahship differed radically from the Messianic expectation of the rest of the Jews (124). Ps. Solomon 17 shows that the Jews expected a national

commander-in-chief type of Messiah, which involved a confusion of the Kingdom of God with an earthly form of the State aimed at world dominion. Jesus clearly avoided the title Messiah exactly because he dissociated himself from the content which the Jews and his own disciples gave to Messiahship (125). Jesus preferred to apply to himself the conception of the Son of Man from Dan. 7:13. But this does not simply make Jesus super-human and transcendent with no concern for affairs of this world. He clearly gave a new content to this relatively unknown title. When John the Baptist sent two disciples to ask about Jesus' identity, the Nazarene interpreted his mission in the world in terms of the prophecies of Isaiah 35:5, 6 and Isaiah 61:1 (Matt. 11:2-5; Luke 7:18-23). In Luke 4:18-19 Jesus once again sees his earthly work in terms of Isaiah 61:1-2. He has come to "preach good new to the poor,.... to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord".

Dunn argues very cogently against W. Wrede's Messianic Secret-hypothesis that the commands to silence about the Nazarene's Messiahship were not part of a secondary theological motif, but a measure taken by Jesus to prevent the false idea of a military Messiahship being connected to him (126). In the same vein Cullman writes:

"The evangelist (Mark) has preserved the recollection that Jesus did not apply the title Messiah to him-

self, because it was too heavily weighted with the ideal of political kingship and could lead to Zealot (sic) misunderstanding" (127).

Jesus' Messiahship was not misunderstood only by the so-called zealots, but even by his closest disciples, as Schubert correctly notes (128).

Jesus' reserve about the Messiah-title is displayed before the High Priest. In reply to the question about Messiahship he answered neither "yes" nor "no", but in a way which does not claim militant revolutionary messiahship or disavow his mission as conceived by himself: οὐ εἶπας (129).

To return to the reasons for the blasphemy for a moment: The present writer feels that we can accept Schubert's reconstruction up to the point where he asserts that Son of God in an adopted sense was an acceptable title for a human Messiah of the Davidic type. The Jews' strict monotheism up to this day makes it extremely unlikely that they would attribute divinity even to their national hero, the Messiah. The leanings of the later Christians towards a doctrine of a divine Messiah would probably have been regarded as a heresy. The only way in which the Sanhedrin hearing as preserved in the Gospels makes any sense is that the priests involved were not very much concerned with strict legal procedure. They have made up their minds beforehand that Jesus deserved death, and the means and procedures they followed to achieve their aim was of secondary importance to them.

The High Priest conducted a "kangaroo-court" in which he wilfully and intentionally combined the titles Messiah and Son of God in order to catch out Jesus. This combination of titles, which under normal circumstances was quite acceptable provided that "Son" was understood in an adopted sense, led now to the accusation that Jesus made himself the Son of God in a divine sense (John 19:7). We have in Jesus' condemnation for "blasphemy" a classic example of *the lengths to which otherwise* honourable religious people will go in vice and dishonesty when their positions and world of security are threatened. Jesus' silence and his assertion about the coming of the Son of Man did not help him at all and he was handed over to Pilate who was conveniently there to take the dirty work of execution from the hands of the religious leaders.

Wanamaker observes that the Romans were always ready for trouble during the Passover and from the perspective of the Jewish leaders it was therefore a good idea to force the Roman governor to handle a tricky and potentially volatile situation (130). The Jewish elite, who initially were uncertain as to the appropriate charge to prefer - they apparently first brought up the religious charge (John 18:13 reflects their uncertainty and John 19:17 the "blasphemy" charge) - were quick in catching on to Pilate's kingly interpretation of the Messiahship: "Are you the king of the Jews?" (Mk. 15:2; Matt. 27:11; Lk. 23:3; Jn 18:33). They finally per-

suaded Pilate to command the execution when, according to John 19:12, they cried, "If you release this man, you are not Caesar's friend; everyone who makes himself a king sets himself against Caesar". We have little doubt, then, that the trial before Pilate turned on the Messiah/King question. Luke alone, apparently using Markan material in formulating the single political charge, explicitly states that Jesus stirred up the Jewish people to revolt, in that he advised the withholding of tribute to Caesar and that he claimed to be Messiah, a revolutionary leader intent on overthrowing Roman domination and become king himself (13.1). Built into Luke's reconstruction of the charge is the absolute falsity of it all: in order to get this effect he deliberately puts into the mouths of the accusers a distortion and misrepresentation of Jesus' words in Mark 12:17 - "Render to Caesar...".

This brings us to a question that has haunted New Testament scholars for a very long time - the reluctance of Pilate to crucify Jesus which is seen as uncharacteristic of this usually brutal Governor. The evangelists have been accused of deliberately "white-washing" Pilate and presenting him as a sympathetic person radically different from his picture in Philo and Josephus (132). Brandon, who interprets Mark as an Apologia ad Christianos Romanos, suggests that for apologetic reasons Pilate is almost exonerated from blame, or at least depicted as a somewhat unwilling

accomplice who yielded to Jewish pressure (133). C.F.D. Moule counters this critique of the Gospel traditions with the argument that application of Tendenzkritik to Philo and Josephus will prove these two sources as being just as biased as some people make out the Gospel accounts to be (134). Sherwin-White has suggested that Pilate's "sympathy" is to be explained in term of the reluctance of Roman governors to involve themselves in questions of the Jewish religious law (135). It is also possible, however, that Pilate was simply playing the various Jewish factions off against one another. The suggestion that the present writer wishes to put forward, however tentatively, is that the whole portrayal of Pilate as a man convinced of Jesus' innocence who makes every effort to set him free, is a conscious literary construction of the evangelists to put across the fact that their Lord was innocent. Their repeated mention of the "false witnesses", Luke's deliberate and explicit mention of the false testimony about Jesus' alleged advice that the Jews withhold tribute, Judas' suicide, the centurion's cry in Luke 23:47, perhaps even the failure of the sun and the tearing of the Temple curtains in Luke 23:45, form part of a literary motif to bring across the innocence of Jesus in the same way in which Paul's shipwreck in Acts 27 has been used to bring across the effect that even the elements of nature attested to the Apostle's innocence (136). This does not, however, rule out the possibility that Pilate did in-

dicare in a lesser measure that he was not convinced that Jesus committed any crime. As was said before, this theory is advanced tentatively only, and some work needs still to be done to substantiate it.

We can turn now to the titulus over the cross, which has played such a prominent role in the evaluation of Jesus' political attitude. As a means of informing the general public of the crime for which a person was executed, and as a warning to potential offenders, a tablet with an inscription was usually fixed to the cross. Elements of mockery were not foreign to the phrasing of such a titulus (137). All the Synoptic gospels mention this ἐπιγραφή τῆς αἰτίας which was ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων in the case of Jesus (Mark 15: 26; Lk. 23:38; Matt. 27:37). John alone calls it the τίτλον, which he renders as Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, and states that it was written in three languages (19:19). The authority by which the titulus was formulated is not mentioned by the Synoptics, but is attributed by John to Pilate. Paul Winter and Brandon, among others, propagate the view that the titulus is the chief witness for the trial, the precise indication of what went on before Pilate, and the exact formulation of the causa poenae (138). βασιλεὺς is seen as the confirmation of a claim that had political connotations and was liable to punishment as an attempt at rebellion. The view that Pilate had reason to think of Jesus as a politically dangerous

person is a modification of the Winter-Brandon view, and is attributed by Bammel to H. Vincent (139). But if the titulus was meant to define the offence of attempted insurrection one would expect the inscription to have been *ληστής* or something to that effect.

Blinzler, again, holds the view that the titulus was meant to refer to the crime of laesa majestas. According to this view the claim to be king was a challenge to the emperor - if Jesus professed his messianic character at the trial, Pilate had no choice but to condemn him (cf. John 19:12). Bammel correctly rejects this view as juridically doubtful and historically unlikely (140). The Synoptic Gospels themselves do not give the impression that the titulus had the intention of defining the exact reason for the condemnation, but rather that it was meant to give a mocking and ridiculing description of some claim, the nature of which was left in the open (141). *ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ*, which is almost identical to the titulus, is cited mockingly in Mark 15:32. *Χριστὸς* alone is given a mocking interpretation in Luke 23:39. John's Gospel tells about the Jewish leaders who asked Pilate not to write "The King of the Jews", but rather, "This man said, I am the King of the Jews", to which Pilate replied: "What I have written I have written" (19:22). According to Mark 15:29f. and Matt. 27:39ff. the onlookers (*παρὰπορευόμενοι*) mocked Jesus. Luke refers to the "onlookers" as *ὄχλος*, and attributes the mocking to

specific groups, the ἄρχοντες , στρατιῶται , and the one malefactor. John does not mention any mocking of Jesus. This is ascribed by Bammel to the Johannean Tendenz:

"... the mention of the mocking would be at variance with the stylized Christology (of John), the answer of Pilate is phrased in such a way that it implies the categorical affirmative that Jesus actually was the messiah of the Jews" (142).

Whereas the wording of the titulus as it is reported in the gospels is in all likelihood authentic, its juridical relevance is restricted by the influence of considerations and emotions of a different nature about its formulation (143). The titulus can therefore not be taken as the "one solid and stable fact that should be made the starting point of any historical investigation" (144), but rather as a piece of evidence, the importance of which can only be assessed in conjunction with the rest of the material on the trial (145).

We have now come to the end of our lengthy discussion of the trial of Jesus with special reference to those issues and texts which are used by the scholars who posit that Jesus belonged to or was sympathetic to the Jewish resistance movements. Instead of using the text in support of yet another pre-conceived opinion, we have attempted to approach the text with an open mind allowing it to speak its message to us. We may now ask what consequences for Jesus' political attitude follow from

his condemnation by the Roman State. We have, of course, discovered that the Gospel passion narratives are basically trustworthy and their portrayal of the situation is to be accepted. Jesus' arrest resulted from his clashes with the Jewish leaders about his religious teachings, his attitude to the law, his criticism of them, but supremely because he rejected the existing social and religious structures of his day and expected imminent divine judgment and a new socio-religious order. He announced the dawning of the eschatological age of salvation in terms of the Kingdom of God, and his healings and exorcisms played a significant role in his mission of actualizing the Kingdom (146).

These and Jesus' popularity with the people presented a threat to the ruling elite and gave the impression that the Nazarene was a danger to social and religious peace. We found no reason to believe that there was any Roman involvement in his arrest. The Sanhedrin found him guilty of the religious charge of blasphemy on grounds that cannot be established with certainty and leaves us with the suspicion that it was a "frame-up" by the priestly elite.

Because they had no capital competence at the time and out of hate they delivered him to Pilate on multiple "charges". The Roman procurator, who understood messiahship in a political sense, questioned Jesus about kingship, eventually sentencing him to death because he aspired to kingship. This misunderstanding

was seized and exploited to the full by the Jews who demanded his crucifixion. From Rome's point of view the very fact that Jesus had a large popular following made him a potential danger and that was in itself reason enough to have him killed. The injustice of the Roman State in condemning Jesus lies in the fact that it took no trouble to ascertain and understand Jesus' attitude. Jesus was, of course, conscious of being the Messiah (in a sense different from that of Jewish expectation) who would establish the Kingdom of God.

The good news about the Kingdom of God was continuous with Deutero-Isaiah's (52:7) prophecy about a future state of affairs on earth when the poor would no longer be poor, the hungry would be satisfied and the oppressed be truly liberated (147). Albert Nolan, in his delightful little book, Jesus before Christianity, correctly asserts that Jesus saw his liberating activity as a power struggle with Satan, a warfare against the power of evil in all its shapes and forms. His healing activity was a kind of burglary of the house of Satan, according to Mark 3:27 and parallels (148). Jesus was convinced of certain victory which would replace Satan's kingdom with the Kingdom of God, in which he and his twelve disciples would rule on behalf of God. Jesus did not say that he or any person would build this Kingdom or that either violence or repetitious religious practices would

achieve it. It was a Kingdom that would come by the power of God or by faith, so Jesus called his audience to repent, to trust and accept God and his rule in their lives. Nolan argues very persuasively that Jesus was bent on achieving the religio-political objective of liberating Israel not only from Rome, but also from their own oppressive structures by persuading Israel to change:

"Jesus was much more genuinely concerned about liberation than the Zealots were. They wanted a mere change of government - from Roman to Jewish. Jesus wanted a change that would affect every department of life and that would reach down to the most basic assumptions of Jew and Roman. Jesus wanted a qualitatively different world - the Kingdom of God. He would not have been satisfied with the replacing of one worldly kingdom by another worldly kingdom. That would be no liberation at all" (149).

The real issue for Jesus, then, was oppression itself and not simply Roman oppression. The Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes and Zealots, who resented Roman oppression, overlooked their own uncompassionate oppression of the poor. The root cause of oppression is man's lack of compassion and it was this aspect that Jesus wanted changed. Segundo is in agreement with many other scholars about the necessity of this change:

"The political life, the civic organisation of the Jewish multitudes, their burdens, their oppression

...depended much less on the Roman Empire and much more on the theology ruling in the groups of scribes and Pharisees. They, and not the Empire, imposed intolerable burdens on the weak....so establishing the true socio-political structure of Israel. To that extent the counter-theology of Jesus was much more political than pronouncements or acts against the Roman Empire would have been" (150).

As far as the use of violence to achieve liberation of the poor and oppressed are concerned, Noland and Pixley's contention is that Jesus was not a pacifist in principle and that his non-violent strategy in the historical sitz-im-Leben cannot be treated as a universal ethical norm (151). Nolan argues that Jesus was not a pacifist in principle, but only in practice, and believes that if there had been no other way of defending the poor and the oppressed and if there had been no danger of an escalation of violence, Jesus might have used violence (152). The arguments of both these scholars are based to a large extent on the silences of scripture. We have no way of knowing what exactly Jesus would have done in a situation where violent action was called for. The often cited "cleansing" of the temple episode does not unequivocally portray Jesus as acting violently unless it can be proven that he used his whip on the people as well as the animals. Even so, using a whip on a person differs radically and qualitatively from killing humans in order to

liberate some. The cleansing of the Temple is better seen as a symbolic act of divine judgment against the priestly elite and their control and manipulation of the cultic media of redemption (153), rather than the coup as a first step towards conquering Jerusalem, as some have maintained (154). We can legitimately draw the following conclusions about Jesus' political attitude:

1. Jesus saw a definite place for the State as an instrument to promote peace and quiet among people. He told his questioners to render to Caesar that which is owed to him (Mk. 12:17). He also reported as having said that Pilate would have no authority unless it was given him by God, which was a traditional Jewish belief (Jn. 19:11; cf. 2 Sam. 12:8; Jer. 27:5f; Dan. 2:21). Therefore Christians have an inescapable obligation to submit to the State and pay taxes. This submission is not to be equated with an uncritical obedience. The State is also not seen as a final institution, but as a temporary one which will cease at the coming of God's Kingdom.
2. The State is not to be given that which belongs to God only, namely worship. When the State makes divine or absolute claims it is to be disobeyed and resisted.
3. If we carefully avoid arguments from the silences of scripture and psychological speculation about

Jesus, we must conclude that Jesus probably rejected attempts to violently overthrow the State. The Kingdom of God could not be realized by human efforts.

4. If we take John 19:11 as words actually spoken by the historical Jesus, and we have good reason to believe that Jesus shared the Jewish belief of Jeremiah 27:5; Dan. 2:21, 37; 4:17 that it is God alone who sets up rulers, then we must conclude that Jesus considered the State as divinely instituted.

CHAPTER 2

PAUL AND THE STATE

Even though Ernst Bammel feels that in an account of the Pauline view of state Romans 13 is of little importance and must be given a place "rather in a side aisle than in the nave" (1), and Charles Villa-Vicencio warns against the fallacy of making one passage of scripture the centre of a particular doctrine (2), there can be no doubt that Rom. 13:1-7 has had a greater influence on the political ethics of the church than even the attitude and message of Jesus (3) and that no passage of scripture has been appealed to more than this one for directives as to church-state relationships (4). It is , furthermore, also true that no passage in the New Testament has been more misunderstood and misused than this one. Throughout the history of Christianity our passage has been used by those favouring the status quo to suggest that the Bible demands absolute obedience to the State (5). It is therefore important for our purposes that a thorough exegesis be made of Romans 13:1-7 in order to get a clearer understanding of what the text says and implies. Further we need to work out why Paul seems to take such an affirmative stand to the State in this pericope while in 1 Cor. 6:4 and his recorded actions in Acts (6).a different attitude is portrayed. Before entering into an exegesis of the

passage a number of important observations need to be made concerning this important pericope.

I

The first observation concerns the authenticity of the pericope. A number of scholars who find the "absolute obedience thesis" of Rom. 13 unacceptable have advocated that the pericope is a later un-Pauline interpolation (7). Because our present concern is to get at the correct meaning of Rom. 13:1-7, we need not enter into the details of the arguments of this position or repeat the counter arguments of scholars such as F.F. Bruce, C.E.B. Cranfield and Ernst Käsemann (8). Bruce typifies the conservative approach to scripture by his observation that the rejection of Rom. 13:1-7 as not having been written by Paul should give no relief to those who find its supposed uncritical obedience ideas unacceptable. Whether the passage was written by Paul or not, it is still canonical scripture and ought therefore to bear the same weight as Pauline injunctions to those who value the Biblical perspective (9). Käsemann's explanation that our passage is a block of traditional teaching which Paul incorporated into his letter is not without grounds and not inconsistent with our own contention that the authenticity of the passage is unquestionable (10). We believe that the solution of the problem of how Paul could possibly have adopted such a stance in Rom. 13:1-7 is not to be found in a judgment of inauthenticity, but rather in a better understanding

of what the Apostle says and implies with the words in our passage.

Our next observation must of necessity concern the identity of the ἐξουσίαι, the "authorities" of whom Paul is speaking in our passage, because unless it can be established that they are rulers of this world in a political sense our use of Rom. 13 in an investigation of Paul's view of State is futile. Now Arthur Bud Ogle recently identified the ἐξουσίαι of Rom. 13 (11) with ecclesiastical officials, the "servant leaders of the church" (12). His argument is altogether unconvincing and his interpretation unlikely, as a close reading of the text will prove. The very reason why Ogle cannot accept the idea of submission to the secular State officials, namely because they become tyrants and persecutors who strip people "of their rights, loyalty and dignity" (13), is also applicable to his so-called "servant-leaders of the church". Examples of tyranny and injustices committed by church authorities abound in the history of Christianity and the Church still has to prove whether it can be a proper example to the secular State. Ogle does not explain how his "servant-leaders of the church" can conceivably be a "terror" to the man who does evil, how they are supposed to bear "a sword" and be "an instrument of vengeance to carry God's wrath", or how they are to be God's "public servants" who receive taxes as Rom. 13 describes their function. Ogle's attempt to solve the supposed con-

tradition of how the State government can be ordained of God, raises more questions than it solves.

Oscar Cullmann argues that *ἐξουσία* does not simply refer to the State, but also to the "invisible angelic powers that stand behind the State government" (14). He admits, of course, that the context makes it plain that Paul in Rom. 13 refers to the State, but insists that the word "authorities" contains a double reference and includes the angelic powers (15). The fact that in Rom. 13 the authorities are those to whom taxes are paid and that elsewhere Paul advocates resistance rather than submission to angelic powers (Eph. 6:12-17), makes it conclusive, as far as the present writer is concerned, that what Paul has in mind in Rom. 13:1-7 is simply and exclusively the governing authorities of the Roman Empire under which the Apostle and his readers lived. A comparison of our pericope with parallel teachings in the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim. 2:1f; Titus 3:1) and 1 Peter 2:13ff., (the latter which is regarded by some as the earliest commentary on Rom. 13:1-7) (16), reinforces our contention that the "authorities" are human rulers.

Our next observation concerns the possible reason why Paul writes as he does in Rom. 13:1-7. What is the motivation for the exhortations in our passage? Why did Paul urge the Roman Christian Church to submit to the Roman authorities? (17). Chrysostom, who made the important distinction that God ordained government (power) but does not select individual rulers (office),

submitted that by his teaching Paul probably intended to draw the governors who are unbelievers to Christianity and believers to obedience. Such obedience could disprove reports of sedition, revolution and subversion on the part of the apostles (18). Although Bammel believes that this conjecture was made without historical backing he himself adopts a very similar position later (19). John Calvin believed that Paul was controverting the belief then current among the Jews that the people of God should not be subject to rulers who are not part of their own number (20). William Sanday and Arthur Headlam propose that Paul's good experience of the Roman government have induced him to estimate too highly its merits (21). This traditional view to which F.F. Bruce also subscribes (22), is rejected by Villa-Vicencio on the grounds that Paul had also negative experiences with the State, which led to his ultimate imprisonment and that the Apostle was aware of the condemnation of Jesus by a Roman court (23). This argument of Villa-Vicencio can be countered by referring to the view of the Gospels, which was probably also held by Paul, that the Jews were really responsible for Jesus' death and also that Acts 21:27-26:32 give the impression that Paul's imprisonment likewise resulted from the hatred of the Jews while the Romans treated him reasonably fairly. Anyway, Romans 13 was written before the Neronian persecution and Paul's imprisonment (24). We can have little doubt the Paul's experience of Roman injustice.

played a role in shaping his general attitude towards the Roman state, but this does not mean that this aspect is necessarily reflected in Rom. 13:3 or that it explains Paul's teaching in Rom. 13:1-7 as a whole. The traditional view is an over-simplification which attributes unbelievable naivety to Paul.

Marcus Borg believes that Rom. 13:1-7 must be understood in the context of the anti-Roman sentiment of Roman Jews (25). Paul's words in our pericope were not intended as abiding principles to be applied in every situation, but as specific theological advice to particular people facing an historically identifiable set of circumstances. Just as Jesus did in his Sermon on the Mount, Paul is telling the Roman church to avoid entanglement in a rebellion against Rome. In a very cogent manner Borg posits that a 50000 strong group of Jews at Rome, both outside and inside the church, in sympathy with the plight of their compatriots in Palestine (26) and in antipathy towards Rome over their own suffering (27), were contemplating rebellion against the State. He quotes from Suetonius "Since the Jews constantly made disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus, he (Claudius) expelled them from Rome" (28). Borg believes that Suetonius reference is to Jewish messianic agitation in Rome, provoked both by the experience of the Roman Jews and sympathy with the contemporaneous aspiration of and outrages suffered by Palestinian Jews. The Christians at Rome, many of whom had strong relationships with non-Christian Jews

(29), inevitably had to ask the question: "What is to be the church's attitude to the anti-Roman sentiments of the Jews brought about by their sufferings?". According to Borg Paul answers exactly this question in Rom. 13:1-7:

"'Let everyone (i.e. every Christian in Rome) subject himself to the supreme authorities'. To say this in this context to this church is to say, 'Your obligation to Israel cannot encompass participation in their cause against Rome'....As such, it is not intended as a generalized statement about the Christians' attitude to all civil authority at all times, but a statement with a particular meaning to the Roman church in their particular situation" (30).

As to the reason why Paul urges the Roman church to submit to Roman authority, Borg argues that while for Paul Christ spans the chasm between Jews and Gentiles (cf. Gal. 3:28; Rom. 1:16; 3:23f., 29f.) Jewish nationalism can only widen it, because it perpetuates the wrong theological notion that God's purpose is primarily for the Jews and because of the social military hostility which it engenders between Jew and Gentile.

It is therefore not God's purpose at this time in history to further that cause. "Anyone who rebels against this authority is resisting a divine institution, and those who resist have to thank themselves for the punishment they will receive" (31). Thus Paul's advice to the Roman Christians to subject themselves to Rome

was not offered primarily for prudential reasons(not only to avoid retribution), but also because participation in Israel's cause would defeat a central purpose of the Gospel for which Christ dies (32).

Borg's thesis has much to commend it, especially the integration it gives to Romans 13:1-7 in relation to the rest of the Roman Epistle and Paul's thought in general. It does not give sufficient attention to Paul's eschatological belief, however. That it leaves unanswered that question of how one is to determine when a pagan state is in fact an instrument of God's wrath and when it is an apostate, demonic power to be opposed in the name of the sovereignty of God - another critique of Villa-Vicencio (33) - is really irrelevant in light of Borg's repeated assertion that the particularistic teaching in our pericope is not meant to provide general principles which are universally valid. As an hypothesis Borg's reconstruction is remarkably coherent and useful. The fact remains, however, that our pericope continues to be used as a paradigm for contemporary church-state relations and it therefore must be re-interpreted according to sound hermeneutical principles in order to speak its message to situations of our day. A number of scholars have posited theories of specific pastoral situations which Paul supposedly addressed at Rome. S. Hutchinson suggests that there was "Zealot" agitation among the Jews in Rome which would affect the Christians, and Paul responded accordingly. He

suggests further that some of the Christian slaves in Rome were beginning to interpret their Christian freedom politically (34).

James Moulder suggests that Paul wrote to counter licentiousness in the church. He draws on Paul Minear's The Obedience of Faith to show that Gentile Christians were contending that their disrespect for civil authorities could be attributes to freedom in Christ. This resulted in licentious opposition to all authority (Rom. 13:13) and not moral opposition to a particular unjust or immoral government. Moulder concludes from this, that because these antinomians were guilty of ordinary criminal and immoral behaviour, the use of Rom. 13:1-7 to oppose conscientious disobedience, which is based on moral and religious convictions, is wrong (35). This position is virtually identical with that of Yoder, who concludes from it that "the text cannot mean that Christians are called to do military or police service" (36).

The most recent contribution to the discussion on Paul's purpose in writing Rom. 13:1-7 is that of Ernst Bammel (37). He also insists that the injunctions in Rom. 13 can only have been formulated in regard to different tendencies on the part of the addressees and that such tendencies ought to be sought in the situation and history of the Roman community. Bammel believes that the public representatives of Roman Judaism were always loyal and subordinate to the Roman State and even the Herodians (38) in order not to jeopardize the

religious tolerance that they enjoyed. The different Jewish factions in Rome (Bammel distinguishes libertines and activists apart from the collaboritities or Jewish establishment) were continually at each others' throats and this gave rise to the stern measures by the Roman administration already referred to above (see our note 26). The Christians shared in the fate of the Jews. Paul was also aware of the Jewish attempts to divert the activities of anti-Jewish officials against the Christians (39). For Bammel the Roman Epistle is possibly Paul's apologia pro vita sua through which he wanted to make clear his political position and to rebut the charges of unreliability and trouble-making against himself and other Christians:

"Romans 13 is written as a warning to the fellow members of the community and even as an alibi, a proof of innocence to the officials; it is the beginning of Christian apologetic. Its comprehension is made possible not by emendation but by fitting it into its proper historical context. The passage does indeed contain a theology, and an even more heightened theology if the state can be deduced from it, but it was not the typically Pauline approach that directed its formulation" (40).

From this brief overview of modern scholarly opinion a distinct pattern seems to be emerging. Firstly, the more conservative type of New Testament scholarship (represented here by Bruce and Bammel) tends to in-

sist on the universal validity of the "principles" set out in Rom. 13:1-7, while the more "liberal" type (such as Käsemann, Moulder, Borg) denies the idea of a universally applicable theology in our pericope. The present writer feels that the case of the latter group who argues (to put it negatively) that no logical ethical system which is normative for all Christian behaviour is prescribed here, has been proved beyond all reasonable doubt. Even so, the case can only be strengthened by an exegesis which proves that the actual text does not counsel absolute obedience to the authorities.

Secondly, in scholarly explanations of Paul's motives and purpose for writing as he did in Rom. 13 the following have been put forward: Apart from Paul's good experiences of Roman justice which must have helped to shape his over-all attitude to the State (it is an oversimplification to suggest that this in itself explains the teaching contained in Rom. 13), the Apostle wrote for any one or combination of the following reasons:-

- to advise Roman Christians against getting involved in Jewish rebellion against the State;
- to combat licentiousness and antinomianism;
- to spell out a behaviour pattern which would counter the current suspicions that the apostle in particular, and Christians in general, were subversive character.

The true answer is most likely to be found in a synthesis or a combination of these factors. Each of them may have played a role, to a greater or lesser extent, in the overall situation

at Rome which was reported to Paul. It is reasonable to suppose that Paul, who had not previously been to Rome, had only a general and second-hand knowledge of what was going on there. Even Paul's conviction about the imminence of the eschaton, posited by Cullmann (41), and the view that the apostle was resisting the attitude which in virtue of heavenly citizenship regards earthly authorities with indifference and contempt (42) may have contributed to the writing of Rom. 13:1-7. The true reason of combination or reasons are lost to us and we have to be satisfied with the conjecture that each of the reasons mentioned may have played a larger or lesser role.

II

We turn now to an exegesis of Rom. 13:1-7. The introductory observations made in the previous section have already in a sense pre-empted the exegetical questions. Our contention thus far is that our pericope does not necessarily contain universally valid principles. We should, however, give those who think otherwise the benefit of the doubt and approach the passage with an open mind and interpret it as if the ideas it contains were of universal validity, so that our study may serve as guidance to those who wish to deduce a "heightened theology" from it. We shall take seriously Ridderbos' advice that this self-contained unit must first be expounded in terms of itself before it can be interpreted in the light of Rom. 12:1f., which makes of it an instruc-

tion on the theme of Christian worship in the everyday world (43).

1. Πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω.

Let every soul be subject to (the) superior author-

ities. οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ Θεοῦ,
For there is no authority except by God and

αἱ δὲ οὖσαι ὑπὸ Θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν.

the existing one have been ordained by God.

The Semitic expression πᾶσα ψυχὴ (every soul) simply means "every one", "every person" (RSV), or "You must all" (JB), and refers to the Christian Church in Rome. No separation of the soul from man's body is intended (45), nor does the phrase imply that the sentence is an apostolic decree for all mankind and all ages (46).

ὑποτασσέσθω (to be subject) - translation of it as "obedient" is incorrect (47). Cranfield indicates that this verb is used thirty times in the New Testament. While the idea of "obedience" is sometimes clearly prominent (as in Rom. 8:7), in the majority of cases, while obedience may be included, it is not clear that it is the predominant thought. The word is used to indicate the proper attitude ^{towards} God (James 4:7); ^{towards} leaders of the church (1 Cor. 16:16); ^{towards} civil authorities (Titus 3:1; + Pet. 2:13f.; cf. Rom. 13:1); of Christian wives ^{towards} their husbands (Eph. 5:22; Col. 3:18; 1 Pet. 3:1,5); Christian slaves ^{towards} their masters (1 Pet. 2:18); of the νεώτεροι ^{towards} the πρεσβύτεροι (1 Pet. 5:5); and the Church ^{towards} Christ (Eph. 5:24).

In Eph. 5:21 it is used to stress a reciprocal obligation. Cranfield argues that ὑποτασσέσθαι within the New Testament implies that one person is placed above another by God, because the person in authority is Christ's representative to us (Matt. 25:40,45). In Rom. 13

ὑποτασσέσθαι does not mean "obey":

"It means surely recognizing that one is placed below the authority by God, and that, as God's servant and the instrument of Christ's kingly rule, and because, in so far as its existence is for the good of one's neighbour, one's service of it is a part of the debt of love owed to the neighbour in whom Christ himself is mysteriously present, it has a greater claim on one than one has on oneself, and such responsible conduct in relation to it as results from such a recognition. This will not mean an uncritical, blind obedience to the authority's every command: for the final arbiter of what constitutes ὑποτασσέσθαι in a particular situation is not the civil authority but God" (48).

We can conclude with Villa-Vicencio that "respect" is a fair, although rough, modern translation for ὑποτασσέσθαι, although for a civil authority to exact a measure of obedience is also required (49). Cranfield indicates some implications of subjection to the authoritarian state which Paul had in mind, namely that ὑποτασσέσθαι is limited to respecting the authorities, obeying them as far as such obedience does not con-

flict with God's laws, and seriously and responsibly disobeying them when it does; paying taxes willingly, since no government can function without resources; and praying for them (1 Tim. 2). The Christian living in a democracy, where he has a responsible share in governing, must translate these principles into the terms of his different political position. *ὑποτασσέσθαι* will for him include voting responsibly in elections, in the fear of Christ and in love to his neighbour (50). One could add, refusing to vote where such a protest becomes necessary (51). He should strive tirelessly in the ways open to him to support just policies and to oppose unjust ones (52). "Subordination is significantly different from obedience. The conscientious objector who refuses to do what his government asks him to do, but still remains under the sovereignty of that government and accepts the penalties which it imposes, or the Christian who refuses to worship Caesar but still permits Caesar to put him to death because of that refusal, is being subordinate even though he is not obeying" (53).

ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις (the superior authorities) has already to some extent been discussed. We can once again note that the context of Rom. 13:1-7 leads one to believe that Paul was referring simply to the government of the day without having any metaphysical substructure in mind (54). *ὑπερεχούσαις* seems superfluous here, but for Käsemann it makes sense in the light of the

negation in verse 1b which, with its αἱ οὐσαι refers explicitly to existing bearers of power who have and claim concrete earthly authority (55). Käsemann strengthens the argument that Paul is referring here to earthly rulers considerably by pointing out that the apostle is using the vocabulary of Hellenistic administration:

"The phrase ἐξουσίαι τεταγμέναι describes prominent Roman officials. λειτουργός carries the wholly secular sense of the authorized representative of an administrative body, while ἀρχή designates the municipal authority. τοῦ θεοῦ διατηγή as a characteristic of the power of state comes from the legal and political sphere. When the imperial authority issues orders, it is given this task by God, so that it becomes itself a divine διατηγή. This does not mean an abstract order as such, but concrete "regulation". The relation of subjects to it is often described as ὑποτάσσεσθαι in correspondence with ὑπερέχοντες, and it is defined in terms of "obligation". Correlative to the power of the sword, which at least in part was transferred to Caesar's deputies, is the practice of commending and honoring worthy citizens and communities in official correspondence. In this connection καλός and ἀγαθός are not moral qualities but characterize political good conduct. It fits in such a context to remind people to fulfil

duties and pay taxes and customs without constraint, which seems displaced in the usual exegesis freighted with metaphysics. In the same connection it is also easy to understand the admonition to demonstrate due fear and honor" (56).

The idea that no ruler attains his office save by the will of God, is well rooted in the Old Testament (57), and has parallels in Wisdom 6:3, 1 Enoch 46:5, and in Josephus, Jewish War, ii.140. This sentence gives the reason - a theological one - for the injunction to subordination. In order to protect his creatures from unbridled sin and anarchy God is believed to provide them with rulers in the same way in which he provides them with sun and rain (58). F.F. Bruce correctly observes that the principle that the civil authorities are ordained by God does not contradict 1 Cor 6:1ff., where Christians are dissuaded from suing or prosecuting one another in secular law-courts. Recognition of the civil authorities does not change the principle that "it is unbecoming for Christians to wash their dirty linen in public". Although the civil authorities, whether Christian or not, are divinely ordained, they have no status in the church (59).

Villa-Vicencio's observation that "those who claim another kind of authority, which may be self-imposed have, according to these words, no authority at all" does not make sense (60). If the Jewish belief "no author-

ity except from God", is taken to its logical conclusion there can be no "other kind" of authority. For Paul, who shared the Jewish belief even the tyrant who came to power as a result of a revolution, rebellion or coup d'état, would simply by virtue of the fact that he was ruling at a certain point in time be ordained by God. John H. Yoder emphatically denies the validity of this interpretation, which he calls the "positive istic view", that a particular government is instituted or ordained by God (61). According to the positivistic view the fact that Hitler or Idi Amin were ruling their respective countries demonstrates in itself that their governments were "of God". The givenness of a particular government itself constitutes its legitimacy. "Whatever is, is the will of God. When we see what exists, we know thereby what God desires us to do" (62). The weakness of the positivistic view lies in the fact that Rom. 13 makes no affirmative moral judgment on the existence of a particular government and says nothing particular about who happens to be Caesar or what his policies happen to be (63).

The "normative view" held by Calvinists is, again, that what is ordained is not a particular government but the concept of proper government, the principle of government as such (64). As long as a given government lives up to the requirements of justice it may claim to be divinely instituted, otherwise it loses its authority and can legitimately be rebelled against.

Christians have a duty to rebel against an unjust government, not because they are against government but because they are in favour of proper government (65).

The question this view raises is, "Who is to judge when a government is so bad that it deserves to be overthrown?". At what point is a government disqualified? Furthermore, nothing in the text of Rom. 13 justifies the concept of a "just rebellion". In the social context of the Jewish Christians in Rome, the whole point of the passage was to take out of their minds any conception of rebellion or even emotional rejection of the existing corrupt pagan government (66). The text calls for submission to whatever powers there be. Yoder attempts to solve the problem by pointing to the fact that the apostle in our text makes a moral statement and not a metaphysical one. Paul is speaking to the present situation of the Roman Christians as representative of Christians throughout the Empire, and not to the nature of all political reality, nor does he describe an ideal social order. Also:

"God is not said to create or institute or ordain the powers that be, but only to order them, to put them in order, sovereignly to tell them where they belong, what is their place...What the text says is that he orders them, brings them into line, that by his permissive government he lines them up with his purpose" (67).

The reader is left to decide between two options:

Either Paul, by employing the traditional Jewish view of "no authority except by God", is holding onto a naive, logically absurd, and outmoded doctrine; or by ΤΕΤΑΓΜΕΝΑΙ he means more or less what Yoder says, namely "to order or line up according to God's purpose". Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon (68) can be used in support of Yoder's view on the meaning of the term, and our modern understanding of "ordain" in Rom. 13:1 has probably contributed much to the current confusion concerning the interpretation of Rom. 13:1; but Yoder's reinterpretation of ΤΕΤΑΓΜΕΝΑΙ still does not sufficiently explain the traditional statement repeated in Rom. 13:1 that authority is ὑπὸ Θεοῦ. It seems to the present writer that the "positivistic" view of government is to be traced back to Paul and the traditional Jewish understanding. In Romans 13:1-7 Paul was not thinking of or setting forth all the possible implications of the traditional (or Stoic) view, but was simply repeating a concept which the immediate recipients of his letter would understand. He simply gave no consideration to the possible Domitians, Hitlers, and Idi Amins of this world, possibly because the world he lived in was fairly stable and he wanted to keep it that way for the sake of the good name of Christianity and the unhindered spread of the Gospel. This view is in line with our contention that Rom. 13:1-7 was written for a particular situation and not to teach universally valid principles. Those

who wish to deduce a heightened theology from Rom.13 will first have to deal with Paul's first premise that all existing rulers, no matter how they came to power and no matter how they rule, are ordained by God. We can, fairly safely, conjecture that if Paul had experienced, for example, the same religious oppression of John of Revelation he would have theologized differently about the position of the Roman government in God's order.

2. ὥστε ἀντιτακόμενος τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ

So the ones resisting the authority has opposed

διαταγῇ ἀνθέστηκεν, ὁ δὲ ἀνθεστηκότες

the ordinance of God; and they who oppose (resist)

ἑαυτοῖς κρίμα λήμψονται.

shall receive to themselves judgment.

Because the civil authority is ordained by God, to fail to render to it the appropriate submission and, instead, to set oneself against it is to be guilty of rebellion against God's ordering and deserving the judgment (punishment, NEB) which the authority will mete out against one. Commentators agree that κρίμα refers to divine judgment which come into operation at once by means of the State's judicial procedures (69).

Oscar Cullmann thinks that this verse is the most misused one in the New Testament because of its popular quotation to justify uncritical submission to the dictates of totalitarian governments (70). In a characteristic way Paul deals in absolute terms, without qualifi-

cation or reservation, with the duty of subjection (71). We cannot but agree with Bruce and Murray that Paul would have endorsed and practised the words of Peter and other apostles: "We must obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29; 4:19, 29). The State can rightly command obedience only within the limits of the purposes for which it has been divinely instituted. It must be resisted when it demands the allegiance due to God alone (72).

3. οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες οὐκ εἰσὶν φόβος τῷ ἀγαθῷ ἔργῳ

For the rulers are not a fear to the good work but to
ἀλλὰ τῷ κακῷ.

the evil.

θέλεις δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν; τὸ ἀγαθὸν

And do you wish not to fear the authority? Do the
ποίει, καὶ ἔξεις ἑπαινον ἐξ αὐτῆς.

good and you will have praise from it.

4. Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν σοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν.

For he is a minister of God to you for the good.

ἐὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῇς, φοβοῦ. οὐ γὰρ

But if you do that which is evil, be afraid; for

ἐκῇ τὴν μάγαιραν φορεῖ. Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονος

he bears the sword not in vain; for he is a minister

ἐστιν, ἑκδικὸς εἰς ὀργὴν τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσον-

of God, an avenger for wrath to the one practicing

τι.

evil.

Paul makes an absolute statement which takes no account

of possible failures on the side of the authorities, asserting that the rulers are a terror to bad conduct and not to the good. The modes of conduct may represent the doers (73), and Paul therefore says that the upright citizen needs not fear the authorities; rather, his good conduct will earn him their approval. The evildoer has reason to fear because the authorities bear the sword exactly for the purpose of punishing evil. The rulers (state authorities) are God's servants appointed for the purpose and task of commending the good and executing God's wrath on the evildoer. Here earthly punishment carries out God's judgment. Käsemann is probably correct in his contention that Paul is simply repeating the traditional Jewish view about the task of civil authorities (74). The apostle may have written in such general terms exactly because he did not have first hand knowledge of the Roman Church and its problems and was therefore not able to write a "casuistical theology" (see our note 71).

The first clause in verse 4 states what is, positively, the chief purpose of magisterial authority. The ruler is the minister of God for good. The term **θεοῦ διάκονός** harks back to verses 1 and 2, where the authority is said to be of God, ordained of God, and the ordinance of God. In verse 4 the specific capacity to which he was ordained is indicated. The title **διάκονός** shows that the civil ruler is invested with the dignity and sanction belonging to God's servant in the

sphere of government. He is the servant of God for that which is good. In 1-Tim. 2:2 Paul indicates what the good is which citizens derive from the civil authority when he requires that prayer be said for kings and all who are in authority "that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all goodness and gravity". Apart from his function to promote earthly well-being, the civil authority's ordination also puts on it the duty of punishing evil, "for he is the servant of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon the evildoer". The divine $\delta\rho\upsilon\gamma\eta$ is referred to according to Rom. 13:5. Earthly punishment carries out God's judgment, as already noted above.

The civil authority has been divinely given the function of avenging evil, from which the individual Christian is explicitly dissuaded in Rom. 12:19. The police and military function of bearing the sword and avenging God's wrath belongs to the civil authorities who have been ordained for the task.

The difficulty with this passage is once again that Paul seems to take no account of the possibility of the government being unjust and punishing the good work while praising the evil. Cranfield discusses three possible reasons for this(75): i. Paul is perhaps overly optimistic because of his good experiences with Roman justice. But such a view does not take serious the bad experiences of Paul recorded in Acts 16:22f., 37; 2 Cor. 11:25ff., or his knowledge of the execution of his innocent Lord. ii. Perhaps Paul is speaking

in terms of ideal principles finding no necessity to discuss possible diversions from these. It is, however, hard for Cranfield to see how such a one-sided and unrealistic picture could serve any serious pastoral purpose. iii. The third reason, which Cranfield finds most probable, is that "Paul means that consciously or unconsciously, willingly or unwillingly, in one way or another, the power will praise the good and punish the evil" (76). The present writer is inclined to favour the second possibility rather than Cranfield's theological conjecture in the third one. Murray contends that all sorts of side problems are not being discussed by Paul because the apostle is setting forth the cardinal principles pertaining to the institution of government and regulating the behaviour of Christians instead of dealing with casuistical theology (77). To this can be added that Paul set out the basic general principles to a congregation whom he did not know and whose problems he was not very familiar with. James Moulder's suggestion that it was because Paul was writing to counter antinomian tendencies in Rome that he does not comment on the fact that governments are sometimes unjust (78), deserves serious consideration especially in the light of our contention that Paul's purpose in writing Rom. 13:1-7 was a combination of zealotic, antinomian, libertine, pseudo-spiritual and other tendencies. We must also not forget that Paul is discussing submission to authorities as part of the Christian's obedience to

God. Verse 1 stated that the reason why Christians must submit to the authorities is because it is God's will. God's children are to subject themselves to the authorities out of a sense of obligation to God (79). Paul thus calls Christians to give allegiance to and be obedient to God even in the face of what is perhaps an unjust government (80).

5. διὸ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι, οὐ μόνον

Therefore it is necessary to be subject, not only

διὰ τὴν ὀργὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν.

because of wrath but also because of conscience.

The Christian must be subject to the authorities, however, not only because they fear the punishment for insubordination or disobedience, but also "because of conscience". Cranfield's interpretation is commendable:

"Whereas the pagan fulfils his obligation to the state (if he does) for fear of punishment and perhaps also because he realizes that the state is, on the whole, beneficial to society, the Christian has a further, and all-important, reason for fulfilling his obligation to it, namely, his knowledge of the secret of the relation in which it stands to God and to Christ" (81).

Recognizing the divine authority of the state as God's servant, his conscience should compel him to render submission. This, however, opens another door, that of conscientious disobedience, although this is not Paul's explicit concern in this text. Out of conscience the

Christian is to render to Caesar what belongs to Caesar, but there is nothing contrary to conscience which rightfully belongs to Caesar (82). The conscience which gives may be the conscience which finds that it must withhold. What is rendered to Caesar must be based in conscience. The limits within which conscience works were set in verse 4: It is only Caesar under God as "God's servant..... for you....unto good" to whom submission is proper. Civil disobedience is the refusal, on grounds of conscience, to comply with a requirement of civil government together with preparedness to accept the penalty. In civil disobedience the Christian refuses the claim made by the state as he answers the higher claim of God as understood by his conscience (cf. Peter's words in Acts 4:18ff. and 5:29).

6. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ φόρους τελεῖτε, λειτουργοὶ

For therefore also you pay taxes; for they are γὰρ θεοῦ εἰσιν εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο προσκαρτεροῦντες. ministers of God, attending to this very thing.

7. ἀπόδοτε πᾶσιν τὰς ὀφειλάς, τῷ τὸν φόρον τὸν

Render to all men their dues, taxes to whom taxes φόρον, τῷ τὸ τέλος το τέλος, τῷ τον φόρον are due, tribute to whom tribute is due, fear to τὸν φόρον, τῷ τὴν τιμὴν τὴν τιμὴν.

whom fear is due, honour to whom honour is due.

In verse 6 Paul speaks of paying taxes "for the same reason", probably referring to the reason of conscience (cf. v.5), and presumably in the belief that taxes are

used for the common good (83). One may well ask whether, by implication, taxes may be withheld for conscientious reasons, but this is not Paul's concern and is thus not dealt with. The fact that the civil authorities are ministers of God is repeated and extended by a phrase with uncertain referent: ".....attending constantly to this very thing". Käsemann considers the possibility that the final phrase of verse 6 may mean that the authorities are constantly seeking to ^{be} God's servants, a statement which he finds "exaggerated if not wholly incredible" (84). Cranfield thinks that the reference is to taxes with which the authorities are constantly busy (85). This sounds awkward because they are not solely concerned with taxes. Barrett subscribes to the most common view that the authorities are pictured in this phrase as constantly promoting the good and restraining the evil (86). Yoder conducts a technical discussion on the grammatical structure of verse 6, concentrating on the function of the participle *προσκαρτεροῦντες*. Most translators consider it as meaning "to exercise the function of further predication", namely: The authorities are ministers of God and they busy themselves with this function of meting out good to the good and evil to the evil. Yoder's own suggestion is that the participle in fact has the function of an adverbial modifier to the predication. That is, they are ministers of God to the

extent that they devote themselves to this function (87). Thus we again encounter the qualification that the authorities have authority only to the extent that they exercise the task appointed to them by God.

Verse 7 is a continuation of those things to be done "for the sake of conscience", a "plerophoric summary" according to Käsemann (88). What Paul intends to communicate here is that the Christian does not render sham obedience and submission in his external conduct. He, like everybody else, has obligations that must be met, even in the political sphere. Paul does not demonize or glorify rulers (89), but he acknowledges them, recognizes their proper place in the order of God and admonishes followers of Christ to render to those in authority everything required of them as long as this does not conflict with their higher loyalty.

Cranfield finds the last two predications in verse 7 problematic. He notes that there is a discrepancy between verse 3 on the one hand and verse 7 on the other in connection with the use of *φόβος* and its derivatives (90). In verse 3 we are told that the rulers are not a *φόβος* to good conduct, and then in verse 7 the injunction is to render *φόβος* to whom *φόβος* is due. The usual understanding that these words in verse 7 apply to rulers is unacceptable to Cranfield, because why would Paul first say that fear is not necessary and then a few verses later advocate fear? Interpreters have sought to overcome the problem by translating verse 7

in the sense of reverence or "respect". Cranfield's solution is altogether different. He suggests that there is a connection between verse 7 and the logion "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's" (Mark 12:17), which raises the likely question whether there is perhaps not also in Romans 13:7 a reference to the debt owed to God (91). Cranfield further suggests that 1 Pet. 2:17 is probably also connected with the logion in Mark 12:17. In 1 Pet. 2:7 the debt to both emperor and king is mentioned: "Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the emperor". He observes that Romans 13:7 and 1 Peter 2:17 both contain four commands. If his suggestion concerning τῷ τῷ φόβῳ is correct, then in both Romans 13:7 and 1 Peter 2:17 the debt to God is mentioned in third place and the debt to the civil ruler in the fourth, which would mean that there can be no question of fear being due to the civil authorities.

Käsemann denies that the last two predications in verse 7 relate to God (92). Murray insists that each of the predications in verse 7 of contextual necessity relates to the authority in the state (93). Cranfield's interpretation is for him both unnecessary and unfeasible, firstly, because the fear of punishment for wrongdoing contemplated in Rom. 13:3 should be absent in reference to God as well as the magistrate. Thus to make God the object does not resolve the problem of discrepancy between the two verses; secondly,

the apostle is dealing with obligations to civil authorities and it would be alien to the coordination and sequence to introduce a reference to the fear we owe to God.

The identical form of statement in all four imperatives requires us to believe that they all belong to the same sphere. Murray suggests that *φόβος* has different connotations in verses 3 and 7 respectively.

Whereas verse 3 refers to the fear of punishment, verse 7 is concerned with the fear of veneration and respect on account of the station of the authorities. In reference to God the sense of the usage in verse 7 would have been that of reverential awe comparable to the meaning in Acts 9:31; Rom. 3:18; 2 Cor. 7:1 and Eph.

5:21 (94). The present writer finds Murray's explanation persuasive, and we can thus conclude that the *φόβος* Christians are supposed to render the authorities in no way contradicts Jesus' injunction in Matt. 10:28 - "Do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul.....".

When interpreted in connection with the context within which our pericope stands, namely as part of the exhortation which begins at Romans 12:1, subjection to the authorities is part of the "reasonable service" or "understanding worship" (*λογικὴ λατρεία*) which Christians are to offer to God in gratitude for all that He has done, is doing, and will do, for them in Jesus Christ (95).

III

Now that we have looked at the text of Rom. 13:1-7 in some detail we are in a position to draw some conclusions from it. Paul's view of the State was that it received its power from God and that it had an important place in God's order, a view which is well rooted in the Old Testament. Barrett reckons that Paul's attitude was that of the petit bourgeois under the Empire (96). The Apostle's motive in writing Rom. 13:1-7 was theological as well as sociological and must further be placed within the eschatological context of his thought as a whole. For him the world was close to the brink of disaster (97) and he probably saw no necessity for rebelling against the government in view of the imminent return of Christ. If the doubtful text in 2 Thess. 2:6f. was written by Paul and if the κατέχον is to be identified with the Roman State (98), the imperial government was regarded as a restraining power which afforded the Christians a peaceful existence and the opportunity to preach the Gospel. Accordingly it was the Christian's duty to maintain the machinery of the State, and to recognize in it God's appointed means of preserving the stability and moral order of the world, and of putting his wrath into operation before the "day of wrath" (99). If this interpretation is accepted, then the "authorities" are indeed the civil authorities of the State, appointed by God not as "executive agents" of the demonic powers (100), but as a bulwark against

demonic powers (101).

From Rom. 13:1-7 itself Paul seems to have seen the state in the following terms:

1. The State (governing authorities) has been set up (ordained, instituted, appointed) by God. There is no power but of God.
2. Governmental authorities of the civil State have been designed by God for human good. They are to help Christians toward the good (salvation, according to Cranfield) and punish those who do evil. It is implied that God wills the State as a means to promoting peace and quiet among men, and that God desires such peace and quiet because they are in some way conducive to man's salvation and the unhindered spread of the Gospel (102). The Christian is then in fact, like all other citizens, a beneficiary of the State, which is in itself a reason why he should support the State (103).
3. Because of this ordination of the state authorities and their position and function in the divine plan obedient submission to the governing authorities is a Christian duty.
4. Resistance to the governing authorities contravenes the ordinance of God and leads to God's judgment on the resisters.
5. God's wrath upon human evildoers is at least partly administered through the governmental authorities of the civil state, who punitively exercise the

sword.

6. Christian obedience to the governmental authority should be motivated not only by the avoidance of retribution but also by one's own conscience.
7. Christians are to pay taxes and customs and offer respect and honour to the governing authorities of the civil state. Prayer for the authorities is mentioned in 1 Tim. 2:2.

On the other hand, Romans 13:1-7 does not specifically deal with at least the following important issues pertaining to the civil state:

1. The possibility of abuse of power of office by governmental authorities.
2. The commanded worship of the governing authority as divine.
3. The persecution of Christians as Christians by the authorities.
4. The permissibility of participation by Christians in a revolution against or overthrow of the governing authorities.
5. The permissibility of the holding of civil office, or the magistracy, by Christians.
6. The church's prophetic witness to the state (104).

By way of deduction from the text and interpretation of Paul's words and actions elsewhere it becomes clear that the apostle was neither practising nor preaching a policy of absolute obedience to the state. We have seen that Rom. 13 does not command obedience but rather

submission to the state, that conscientious disobedience does not necessarily undermine the submission owed to the state, and that Paul himself gave us an example of conscientious disobedience because of a moral conviction in Acts 16:11-40. Paul rather naively believed that the existing government should remain in power until God intervened either to overthrow it or bring the world to an end. He does not consider the possibility of God using Christians as his agents in the overthrow, and does not seem to allow in his prayers for the rulers for the inclusion of petitions for their overthrow. Paul was probably so convinced of the imminence of the eschaton that these considerations were unnecessary.

One final question concerns the applicability of Paul's political thought to our own time and situation. In this connection E. Käsemann has something very important to say. For him the important thing that Paul was saying in Rom. 13, that which in Paul's thought has universal validity, is that God demands his children to live out their worship in everyday life and the given situation:

"If church history brings to light the danger in Paul's call for ὑποταγή, this is because it makes a theory out of his call in a particular situation, develops a system out of exhortation, and sacrifices the Spirit for the sake of the law. When a new situation is set up, for example, a democratic system, Paul's true concern, namely,

that God be served in the political sphere as well, is not invalidated. But it does not tolerate holding fast to antiquated slogans, nor is it fostered by an outdated metaphysics. The old demand must be grasped in terms of the new reality and its problems, and ~~app~~plied to these. Paul is confident that the charismatic community can do this" (105).

The truth of these words can already be seen in the different attitude towards the state contained in the book of Revelation to which we shall now turn.

CHAPTER 3

THE STATE IN THE BOOK OF REVELATION.

Revelation 13 is traditionally contrasted with Romans 13:1-7. Whereas in Romans 13 the State is God's servant unto good for the people, in Rev. 13 the State is a beast to be resisted. In Rom. 14 the State is seen as a force for justice. In Rev. 13 the State is brutish and unjust. Whereas in Rom. 13 the State is seen as under God, in Rev. 13 the political beast is idolotrous, worshipped by the second beast of cultic religion (1). Historically Romans 13 comes from the period of transition from Claudius to Nero when, according to Frank Stagg, the influence of Seneca and Burrus was felt (2). Rev. 13 was probably written in the time of Domitian, who wanted to be known as "Lord and God" (Dominus et Deus).

In order to examine Rev. 13 in relation to Rom. 13:1-7 it will not be necessary to enter into the question of the authorship and date of Revelation. It will have to suffice merely to note that the great majority of modern interpreters date the writing of this New Testament Apocalypse during the reign of Emperor Domitian (A.D. 81-96)(3), and regard the book as having been written by a Jewish Christian, John, who was banished to Patmos for his faith (4). The present writer believes that the historical situation presupposed by

this "traditional" view best explains the symbolism employed in Revelation and that the "Preterist" or Contemporary Historical method of interpretation which will be followed in our exegesis is the most realistic and plausible approach (5).

A.M. Farrer once made the significant observation that "an exposition of the Revelation is at the same time an argument. And it is one of those arguments in which nothing short of the whole story proves the case" (6). It will, therefore, be better to postpone discussion of the symbolism until we come to the exegesis of Rev. 13, when John can be allowed to unfold his theme in his own way (7). It is also true that the theme of Church and State is not limited to the thirteenth chapter but is spread throughout Revelation (8). Because the most concentrated and explicit discussion appears in chapter 13, however, only that one chapter shall be discussed in detail while frequent references shall be made to other relevant verses. It is important for a clear understanding of the text, though, that at least a following sketchy history of the Roman kingship be kept in mind.

The "Babylon" of Revelation stands for the persecuting Roman Empire (9). The great enemy of the cause of God in the world is seen as Babylon, who demands worship for its emperor. The Roman emperors who have a special relevance to our study, with the duration of each one's reign in brackets, are as follows:

Nero (A.D. 54 to 68)
 Galba (A.D. 68 to 69)
 Otho (A.D. 69)
 Vitellius (A.D. 69)
 Vespasian (A.D. 69 to 79)
 Titus (A.D. 79 to 81)
 Domitian (A.D. 81 to 96) (10).

Nero, the first persecutor of the Church, had Paul, and probably also Peter, killed (11). At the time of the great fire of Rome in A.D. 64, a rumour went around that Nero himself started the fire. As a scapegoat he shifted the guilt onto the Roman Christians. Tacitus describes how Nero crucified many Christians, had them mauled by dogs, and set others on fire (12). According to Suetonius Nero committed suicide on June 9, 68 (13). J. Massyngberde Ford, however, knows of a tradition which has it that after revolts against this unpopular Caesar's authority in Gaul and Spain, the Praetorian guard and the Senate repudiated him. The Senate declared Nero a public enemy and cut his throat (14). Whatever the truth, a rumour spread that Nero had not died but had escaped to Parthia from whence he would return to lead armies against Rome (16). R.H. Charles reminds us that so completely did the idea prevail that Nero would return as the Anti-Christ that in Armenian the word Nero became and remains the equivalent for the Anti-Christ. When John wrote Revelation these ideas were strongly held by his contemporaries (17).

The significance of this bit of history will be considered later when we contemplate John's symbolism concerning the beast's head with the mortal wound which was healed in Rev. 13:3, 12, 14.

Of supreme importance to our understanding of Revelation and the clash between Church and State evident in it, is the emperor worship which from the time of Augustus Caesar became an organized part of the political and religious system of the Empire. Over a century before the establishment of the Empire a certain voluntary deification of the State arose in the provinces in the payment of divine honours to the goddess Roma and the Roman governors. This worship received a powerful impulse when the majesty of the State became personified in the emperors, who used this deification as a means to strengthen their authority (18).

While the earlier emperors were satisfied with the voluntary worship which their servile people offered zealously, Caligula (A.D. 37-41) demanded universal homage to his statue. This led to persecution of the non-compliant Alexandrian Jews. Under Nero and his successors down to Domitian, the emperor cult continued as one of the established religions, although its progress is not marked by edicts enforcing it or any notorious persecutions arising from it (19). It is in the reign of Domitian (81-96) that we reach an insistence upon the cultus which was accompanied by an active persecution of Christians. Domitian strenuously claimed

divinity in his lifetime, insisting that he be addressed and referred to as Deus et Dominus Noster (our God and Lord).

Rejection of the cult was regarded in general as disloyalty to the person of the emperor. The priesthood of the cultus was everywhere established throughout the provinces of Asia, Europe and Africa and the reigning emperor as well as those deified by vote of the Senate after their deaths, had everywhere their temples, priests, and festivals. In this worship political and religious devoteeism, State and Church, became identical in a classical example of civil religion. Isbon T. Beckwith comments on it as follows:

"The Christian Church could not fail to see the significance of the movement. As long as the Roman state did not arrogate to itself an inherent religious character Paul could speak of as a 'minister of God', and Peter could give the injunction 'Honour the King'. But when the homage belonging to God alone was demanded as due to the person of the emperor the Christian must see concentrated and culminating therein the whole conflict between the Church and the world" (20).

Christians resisted claims made by human rulers which usurped the prerogatives of God and they were prepared to undergo the suffering resulting from their refusal to worship the emperor. Domitian's persecution did not consist in the slaughter and atrocities instituted by

Nero. Deaths were inflicted in different parts of the Empire, but penalties such as imprisonment, confiscation of property, ostracism and economic boycott of Christians were more usual (21).

Most scholars agree that the situation contemplated in the book of Revelation is that of a period towards the end of Domitian's reign and that John's purpose was, among other things, to advise the Church of the Satanic nature of the hostility of the Roman government which was manifesting itself in measures to suppress Christianity (22). Satan was using the Roman state as a weapon in his warfare against Christ. The hostility would increase but Satan would soon be overthrown. The activity of Satan in Rome's persecution of the Church forms the underlying motive of Chapter 13 and the explanation is given in 17:8-11; 2:10,13; 12:9, 12, 17 and 20:2. Utter destruction of Rome by God's wrath is foretold in chapters 17 - 19 as well as in 14:8; 16:19.

I

We can now turn to an exegesis of the text of Rev. 13,

1. Καὶ εἶδον ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης θηρίον ἀναβαῖνον, ἔχον

And I saw a beast coming up out of the sea, having

κέρατα δέκα καὶ κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κεράτων
seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten

αὐτοῦ δέκα διαδήματα, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτοῦ ὀνόματα
crowns, and upon his heads names of blasphemy.

2. βλασφημίας. καὶ τὸ θηρίον ὃ εἶδον ἦν ὅμοιον παρβάλει,

And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard,

καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὡς ἄρκου, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ
 and his feet as (those) of a bear, and his mouth as
 ὡς στόμα λέοντος. καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ δράκων
 the mouth of a lion. And the dragon gave to him
 τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξουσίαν
 his power and his throne and great authority.

3. μεγάλην. καὶ μίαν ἐκ τῶν κεφαλῶν αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐσφαγμένην
 And (I saw) one of his heads as it were wounded to
 εἰς θάνατον, καὶ ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ ἐθεραπεύθη.
 death, and his death stroke was healed. And all
 καὶ ἐθαυμάσθη ὅλη ἡ γῆ ὀπίσω τοῦ θηρίου,
 the earth wondered after the beast,

4. καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ δράκοντι ὅτι ἔδωκεν τὴν
 And they worshipped the dragon, because he gave his
 ἔξουσίαν τῷ θηρίῳ, καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θηρίῳ
 authority unto the beast, and they worshipped the
 λέγοντες, Τίς ὅμοιος τῷ θηρίῳ, καὶ τίς
 beast saying: Who is like unto the beast, and who
 δύναται πολεμῆσαι μετ' αὐτοῦ;
 can make war with it?

5. Καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ στόμα λαλοῦν μεγάλα
 And there was given to him a mouth speaking great
 καὶ βλασφημίας, καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἔξουσία
 things and blasphemies, and authority was given
 ποιῆσαι μῆνας τεσσαράκοντα καὶ δύο.
 to him to continue (act) forty and two months.

6. καὶ ἤνοιξεν τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἰς βλασφημίας πρὸς τὸν Θεόν,
 And he opened his mouth in blasphemies against God,

βλασφηησαὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ, τοὺς
to blaspheme his name and his tabernacle, (and)

ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ σκηνοῦντας.
them that dwell in heaven.

7. καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων

And it was given to him to make war with the saints

καὶ νικῆσαι αὐτούς, καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία

and to overcome them, and authority was given to him

ἐπὶ πᾶσαν φυλὴν καὶ λαὸν καὶ γλῶσσαν καὶ ἔθνος.

over every tribe and people and tongue and nation.

8. καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ

And all that dwell on the earth shall worship him,

τῆς γῆς, οὓς οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ

everyone whose name has not been written from the

βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου ἐσφαγμένου ἀπὸ

foundation of the world in the book of life of the

καταβολῆς κόσμου.

Lamb that has been slain.

9. Εἴ τις ἔχει οὖς ἀκουσάτω.

If anyone has an ear let him hear.

10. εἴ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν, εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει·

If anyone is for captivity, to captivity he goes;

εἴ τις ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀποκτανθῆναι, αὐτὸν ἐν μαχαίρῃ

If anyone shall kill with a sword, he must be killed

ἀποκτανθῆναι.

with a sword

Ἔσδε ἐστὶν ἡ ὑπομονὴ καὶ ἡ πίστις τῶν ἁγίων.

Here is the patience and the faith of the saints.

The last verses of chapter 12 pictured Satan (the great

dragon, that ancient serpent who is called the Devil and Satan - 12:9) standing by the sea as if to summon his henchmen from it. Unable to reach the woman (24) he calls on his wicked helpers to destroy her offspring. It is not necessary to repeat here R.H. Charles' extended and interesting analysis of the underlying sources of this and the following symbolism, as it does not shed much light on the meaning of the vision which we are seeking (25). The first ten verses of Rev. 13 introduce us to the first of two agents through which Satan carries out his war against believers (cf. 12:17). In apocalyptic language these agents are called beasts (θηρία). The first one comes out of the sea, a grotesque sevenheaded monster. One of his heads is mutilated by the slash of a sword, but the wound was healed. John's monster has the combined characteristics of a leopard, a lion, and a bear. It has ten diadems upon its ten horns and a blasphemous name upon each head. Satan armed this beast with his own power and authority.

1. There is a very wide measure of agreement that this first beast is the Roman Empire with its emperor worship and persecution of the Church (26). There can be little doubt that John's figure was suggested by Daniel's vision of the four beasts from the sea (Dan. 7:3). In Rev. 11:7 and 17:8 the beast is said to come up out of the abyss (ἄβυσσος = bottomless pit, RSV), which does

not really contradict our present text because in each case the "source of all evil" is referred to (27). The ten horns of John's beast are like those of Daniel's fourth beast (Dan. 7:7). In Daniel they represent the ten kings which rise out of the fourth kingdom (28). In Rev. 17 the ten horns are also ten kings (17:10), but in the present vision it is only said that they wear diadems, the sign of royal authority (cf. Rev. 19:12). Mounce suggests that the reason why the crowns are worn on the horns instead of the heads signifies that the authority of the beast rests on brute force (29). That the beast has seven heads stresses its relationship to the seven-headed dragon of Rev. 12:3, from whom the beast derives its power and authority (13:4). It is not necessary to add up the number of heads of the four beasts in Daniel's vision to get to the seven of John's beast (30). In apocalyptic the number seven carries the idea of completeness and a seven-headed monster would be an appropriate symbol for the ultimate enemy of the believing church (31). The blasphemous names upon the heads reflect the tendency of the Roman emperors to assume titles of deity.

As to the meaning of the seven heads; many attempts have been made to identify the emperors whom they represent. William Barclay believes that the seven heads of the beast signifies seven emperors

from Tiberias (A.D. 14 - 37) to Domitian (A.D. 81 - 96), with Galba, Otho and Vitellus left out. These three who reigned for very short periods are added to the seven represented by the heads to be symbolized as ten horns (32). The most commonly held view had Nero, the first persecutor of Christians, as the first head (which was slashed and healed). The three emperors of short reign are included and this reckoning ends with Domitian (33). Beckwith, however, argues that the number of seven is purely symbolical here. The apocalyptist means to represent the Roman power as a historical whole:

"Our passage is not history, but a simple piece of eschatological symbolism, like those in the other apocalypses....The Roman Empire must fill out its destined place in history, it must have its complete tale of kings denoted by the typical number 7; the Antichrist comes, who succeeds the Roman power which he destroys; he forms an eighth ruler added to the seventh, just as the 'little horn' (Antiochus) Daniel forms an eleventh added to the tenth (7:8, 24), but at the same time he is 'of the 7', inasmuch as he is one of the 7 (Nero) reincarnate"(34).

A decision as to which of these and other theories is the correct one needs not to be made within the context of the present study. What is important for our immediate purpose is the fact that John doubtlessly regarded the State of his time as an

agent of Satan.

As to the horns of the beast there exists even greater uncertainty as to their interpretation. We have already noted above that Barclay sees the horns as the same seven kings represented by the heads with the three kings of short reign added. His interpretation is not convincing. Why would John want to symbolize the same seven emperors as both heads and horns? Beckwith believes that the horns symbolize a number of kings who are to aid Satan's deputy in the end, allies to be joined with the returning Antichrist (Nero) in the destruction of Rome (35). In the light of Rev 17:12ff. Beckwith's interpretation is of greater cogency than Caird's contention that the horns are "puppet kings of client kingdoms or men potentially of imperial rank who never actually occupied the throne" (36). The crown worn by the horns seem to indicate that they were in fact kings. That the first beast in John's vision is the Roman Empire is confirmed in later verses which state that it has Satan's authority (verse 4), blasphemed the name of God (verses 5-6), warred victoriously against the saints (verse 7), and received the worship of the pagan world (verses 4, 8). Mounce points out that although the vision employs references to contemporary history, its complete fulfilment is reserved for the final eschatological conflict; and again:

"The beast has always been, and will be in a final intensified manifestation, the deification of secular authority" (37).

Although the present writer interprets the Book of Revelation in the Contemporary-historical sense and sees in it no prophecies that sometime in future with situations described would arise, it is easy to see parallel situations in the later history, so that the message of Revelation remains relevant to every age.

2. Our text as it stands combines the characteristics of Daniel's three beasts in Dan. 7:4ff. William Barclay comments:

"For John the Roman Empire was so satanic and terrible that in itself it included all the evil terrors of the evil empires which had gone before. It was, as it were, the sum total of all evil" (38).

When John says that the dragon conferred on the monster his own power and throne, we must not lose sight of the fact that, in spite of his ejection from heaven, he still has a throne to confer (39). He is still the prince of this world (John 12:31; 14:20; 14:11), and the world is in fact enemy occupied territory, a house held by the "strong man fully armed" until a stronger than he shall come to dispossess him (Mark 3:27; Matt. 12:29; Luke 11:21f.). Satan's conferring of power on the monster

is reminiscent of the temptation of Jesus: "To you I will give authority over all this and the glory that belongs with it, for it has been made over to me, and I give it to whom I will (Luke 4:6). The offer then rejected by Jesus was taken up by the Roman government. But here Caird correctly warns that we must not think that John is writing off all civil government as an invention of Satan. Whatever Satan claims, the truth is that "the Most High controls the sovereignty of the world and gives it to whom he wills" (Dan. 4:17). In the war between God and Satan, the state is one of the defences established by God to contain the powers of evil within bounds, part of the order which God has established in the midst of chaos as Rom. 13:1-7 has it (40). But when men worship Caesar, or when the state demands absolute loyalty and obedience and worship that are due to God, then the state goes over to the Enemy:

"What Satan calls from the abyss is not government but that abuse of government, the omniscient state. It is thus misleading to say that the monster is Rome, for it is both more or less, because Rome is also, even among all the corruptions of idolatry, 'God's agent of punishment for retribution on the offender' (Rom. 13:4)" (41).

We cannot but wholeheartedly agree with Caird, but

we must add that the persecution in itself, quite apart from or in addition to the emperor worship, contributed to the forming of the apocalypticist's attitude to the state. This is an aspect often neglected by commentators, who treat emperor worship as the only factor which led to the negative attitude of John to the Roman Empire. It is not far-fetched to assume that the attitude of the State to the Church at any particular time largely dictates the attitude of the Church to the State. Distinct and apart from persecutions resulting from the Christian's non-compliance to emperor-worship, the Church found the Roman government abusing its power by punishing the good and rewarding the evil. This was the case, for example, in the atrocities Nero committed against Christians after the great fire in Rome, when denial of emperor worship was not so much the problem as Nero's attempt to shift blame from himself to the Christians. We must, therefore, not limit the reasons for the Christians' negative view of the State in Revelation to the demand by Caesar of that which is God's, namely worship; we must also allow for the possibility that non-performance or distortion by the State of its divinely appointed duties is partly responsible for a feeling of rejection toward the State. It is only when the state continues to act within the limitations and obligations of its delegated author-

ity that the believer can freely submit to its regulations.

3. The heads of the beast symbolize Roman emperors, and of these the only one who could be said to be restored after having been slain was the Nero of the Nero-redivivus myth. The basic problem of identifying the slain head as Nero (or Caligula, as some commentators do) is that the text does not say that the head was restored from the death-stroke, but that the beast itself recovered (42). Caird, sees the year of civil war after the death of Nero, in which the whole future of the empire was in jeopardy, as sufficient explanation of the symbolism (43). It is significant that the precise phrase, *ὡς ἐσφαγμένην*, which occurs here, is used in Rev. 5:6 of the slaughtered Lamb of God who rose from the dead. The healing of the beast's mortal wound is interpreted in 13:14 as resurrection from death, where "lived" means not "continue to live in spite of the wound", but "lived again after being smitten by the sword" (44). This ties in well with the motif of satanic imitation of the true by the false which different interpreters have noticed in Rev. 13 (45). There is a strong typology in the presentation of the Anti-Christ figure. The Anti-Christ claims a sovereignty comparable with that of the Christ of God (cf. many diadems of 19:12, the granting of power and throne and authority by God to Christ in

Rev. 3:21) John does not call the beast the Anti-Christ in so many words, but since the second beast is called "the false prophet" (15:13; 19:20; 20:10), it is reasonable to suppose that he thought of the first beast as a false Christ (46).

The whole earth followed the beast with wonder. The world was astonished at the marvellous return of Nero-redivivus (47). Emperor-worship was never, before Domitian, forced onto an unwilling people. It was initially the spontaneous gratitude of a war weary world for the Roman law and peace (48). The security and plenty which the old gods could not give was provided by Rome and led to an extreme hero-worship. Preston and Hanson note that man is made to worship some absolute power and in the last analysis will give his allegiance either to the beast (whose power is that of inflicting suffering) or to the Lamb (whose power lies in accepting suffering)(48).

4. The inhabitants of the earth worship not only the beast but the dragon as well - the one who gives authority to the beast. Deification of secular power is in fact the worship of Satan (49). The words of praise ascribed to the beast echoes such Old Testament passages as Ex. 15:11 - "Who in the skies can be compared to the Lord?" (cf. also Ps. 89:6f.; Is. 40:25f.; Micah 7:18f.). The motivation for worship of the beast is not his moral greatness but his mighty power: "Who is like the

beast and who is able to make war with him?". The beast's authority is that of Satan himself. In their comments on verse 4, Beasley-Murray and Cullmann (50) both argue that it was precisely Rome's demand that people give proof of their loyalty to the State by worshipping Caesar which compelled the early Church to resist Rome to the death. Now it is true that John agrees with Paul's teaching on the State in Rom. 13 that there is no real authority except from God (50). Just as Daniel taught that a ruler who does not recognize this axiom becomes a beast as Nebuchadnezzar did, so John depicts the State as an embodiment of the spirit of the chaos monster (51). John's experience of Rome's claim to dominate the souls of men leads him to declare that such a totalitarianism comes not from the God who bestows authority on men, but from the Devil, who usurps and destroys men (52). Cullmann argues that if the Roman State had a different loyalty-test from emperor worship, the Christians would be able to meet it in good conscience. The satanic element in the Roman Empire lay in this deification alone (53). In our comment on verse two we have noted that such a view as advocated by Beasley-Murray and Cullmann allows for conscientious objection on religious grounds. We have reason to believe, however, that the persecutions, quite apart from emperor worship, played a role in

the negative attitude to the State in John. The fact that the State at times reversed and contradicted or abused its God-given duty to reward the good and punish the evil, gave rise to resistance. Conscientious disobedience on moral grounds cannot be ruled out in favour of an absolutist religious view.

5. There was given to the beast a mouth speaking great things, an idea once again taken from Dan. 7:8, 20, 25 and 11:36, where the "little horn" has a mouth speaking great things. The great things or "proud things" are blasphemies or boastful words as is explained more fully in verse 6, and refers to haughty and blasphemous words uttered by the anti-god emperor. The ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ (was given to him) which occurs four times in verses 5 and 7 has the meaning of "it was allowed him", and this emphasis is brought out well in the New English Bible:

"The beast was allowed to mouth bombast and blasphemy, and was given the right to reign.....It was also allowed to wage war on God's people and to defeat them, and was granted authority over every tribe and people....." The passive "was given" emphasizes the subordinate role of the beast. A good question here is, "Who allowed the beast these things?". It cannot be the dragon, because he would not limit the reign of his deputy to forty-two months". We have to recognize that God,

the ultimate source of all power, is conceived by John as the One giving the beast his blasphemous mouth and allowing him to reign over his people. He allows the Antichrist to do these things in order to bring about his own purpose of good and of grace, of judgment and of glory (54). One is reminded of Martin Luther's well-known words that even when the Devil works his worst he remains God's Devil (55). The beast operates within the limitations determined by God and he can only reign by divine permission. In this John agrees with Paul that even this idolatrous Roman administration received its authority from God.

The time of the beast's blasphemy is forty-two months. T.F. Glasson in a helpful excursus, suggests that the forty-two months must be taken literally, because "it was believed that Antichrist would reign for $3\frac{1}{2}$ years" (56). The forty-two months is the traditional apocalyptic period for religious persecution. This temporal designation is given in Rev. 11:2 and appears also in 11:3 and 12:6 as 1260 days and in 12:14 as "a time, and times, and half a time". All these descriptions refer to a similar length of time. The primary reference here is evidently to the period of Jewish suffering under Antiochus Epiphanes in 167-164 B.C. It became a conventional symbol for a limited period of time during which evil would be allowed free rein. In Luke 21:24 it

is called "the times of the Gentiles" (57). Mounce suggests that the repeated use of these symbols in Revelation and the contexts in which they appear may serve to point out that the periods of final witness, divine protection, and pagan antagonism are simultaneous (58).

This verse, then, brings out the facts that the state is temporary, subordinate in this context immediately to Satan but ultimately to God, and that even in its war against God's people it is still serving God's purpose.

6. The beast blasphemes the name of God and his tabernacle and them that dwell in heaven. This activity of the Antichrist is portrayed in 2 Thess. 2:4: He "opposes and exalts himself against every so-called god.....proclaiming himself to be God". The blasphemy of Antiochus (Dan. 7:25; 11:36) and the use of divine titles by the Roman emperors would for John identify the Antichrist as the one in whom secular authority had assumed the mantle of deity (59). The text in verse 6 is in doubt. In some manuscripts καὶ is added before τοὺς (60). Other manuscripts omit both τοὺς and σκηνοῦντας so that the final phrase reads "his tabernacle in heaven" (61). We must consider all the possibilities: If καὶ (and) is read as the first word of the last clause, there are three objects of blasphemy: the name of God, his tabernacle, and those who dwell in

heaven. Caird, Mounce, and Beckwith favour the reading where the final clause is appositional and reads as follows: "It opened its mouth in blasphemy against God, blaspheming his name and his dwelling, that is, those who dwell in heaven" (Caird) or ".... to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, even them that dwell in heaven" (62). According to these readings God's dwelling is identified with "those who dwell in heaven". For Caird "those who dwell in heaven" are men whose citizenship is in heaven according to Phil. 3:20:

"In the streets of Philadelphia the dwellers in heaven rub shoulders with 'inhabitants of earth'. The monster's attack on the church is a blaspheming of that divine presence which is to be found wherever two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ" (63).

For Mounce "those who dwell in heaven" are either angelic beings, or the church viewed ideally as seated in heavenly places. Beckwith believes that by the name of the place (heavenly tabernacle) those who occupy the place are meant (64). It is sufficient for us to note that the impious claims of the emperors are here in the mind of John.

7. Authority was given to the beast to make war with the saints and to overcome them, and authority was given to him over every tribe and people and tongue and nation. The first line goes back to Dan. 7:21,

but the role of the "little horn" is taken here by Nero redivivus. Charles argues that the persecution referred to is not the first under Nero, but in the future when Nero is expected to return, because it is seen as worldwide (65). At Nero's reappearance he is to wage a violent persecution on God's people. He is allowed to have authority over "every tribe and people and tongue and nation". In this he is again a type, an imitation, of Jesus, the same formula being used in praise of the Lamb in Rev. 5:9. In our comments on verse 5 it has already been pointed out that God is seen as the one granting the authority. The twice repeated "it was given to him" stresses the subordinate role of the beast. Even though the beast says great and boastful things about himself and blasphemes God, he does not realize that he is in fact allowed his authority and reign by God, who uses him for his purposes. The beast is the dragon's puppet, but ultimately the whole operation is under the control of God. Although the saints are to be overcome (that is, put to death) by the beast, the real victory belongs to them. According to Rev. 15:2 they are exactly those who "come off victorious from the beast". In the crucial test of faith they relinquish their lives rather than their confidence in God (66).

8. "All who dwell on earth will worship the beast, everyone whose name has not been written in the

book of life of the Lamb that was slain before the foundation of the world", is the rendering of the original Greek which is today increasingly accepted (67). The traditional view has been that the phrase ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου is to be connected with γέγραπται, as in Rev. 17:8 (68). In favour of this connection is quoted Eph. 1:4 and Matt. 25:34. Thus the election of the faithful is from the beginning and only the elect can withstand the claims of the imperial cult. To acknowledge such claims by the state is in reality to acknowledge the supremacy of Satan. The faithful are thus secured by their election from the foundation of the world. In Rev. 7:3 ff., having already exhibited their steadfastness in actual temptation, they have been marked on their brows as God's own possession, and have thus been secured against the spiritual assaults of Satan but not against martyrdom (68). It cannot be denied that this interpretation is correct in the case of Rev. 17:8 and that John had a strong conviction about this kind of predestination. In the present passage the Greek construction, however, suggests that ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου is to be connected with ἐσφαγμένου. We shall not repeat here the evidence brought forward by Charles in support of this view. Suffice it to say just as Moses is regarded by Judaism as having been ordained as the mediator of God's covenant "from the foundation of the world"

according to Assumption of Moses 1:14, Christianity claimed that Christ was ordained from that period as the Redeemer of mankind (70). The death of Christ was a redemptive sacrifice decreed in the counsels of eternity (71). The temptation which Jesus rejected at the beginning of his ministry (Matt. 4:8-10), namely the satanically inspired perversion of secular authority, is yielded to by all those whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb - all those who are pagans and halfhearted or nominal (instead of committed) Christians. One can sense in these words a rebuke and veiled warning to Christians who would be prepared to renounce Christ and yield to the popular emperor worship. To succumb to emperor worship would be a proof that one's name has not been written in the book of life. The idea of a divine register is already found in Moses' encounter with God on Sinai (Deut. 32:32f.). In the New Testament it is mentioned in Phil. 4:3 (cf. 1 Pet. 1:19f.) as well as six times in Revelation (3:5; 13:8; 17:8; 20:12, 15; 21:27) and it refers to a register of names of all those who belong to God. Here and in Rev. 21:27 the book of life is said to belong to Christ. It is through his sacrifice that life is possible (Rev. 5:9f.). we note that names may also be blotted out of the book of life (Rev. 3:5), which means that having one's name in the register

would offer something less than complete security in the time of trial.

9. "If anyone has an ear, let him hear.
10. If anyone is for captivity, to captivity he goes!
If anyone kills with the sword, he must be killed with the sword.

"Here is the patience and the faith of the saints". The contemporary equivalent of verse 9 would be, "Now hear this" (73). It occurs in each of the seven letters (Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 19; 3:6, 13, 22) and recalls the expression of the Jesus in Matt. 11:15 (cf. Mk. 4:9). It alerts the reader to the importance of that which follows.

The proverbial style of verse ten has led to several scribal attempts to alter the text for clarification of the meaning (74). A number of manuscripts refer both couplets to the persecutors of the church by adding a verb which makes the first line read, "If anyone leads (75) into captivity, into captivity he goes". Taken in this sense the verse would stress that the enemies of God's people would be punished for their persecution of believers in the same form they employed - captivity for captivity, sword for sword, eye for an eye. How this can be said in connection with "Here is the patience and faith of the saints" is difficult to understand.

The Alexandrinus manuscript interprets both coup-

lets in reference to the saints by changing the second verb to a passive infinitive and reading: "If anyone is to be killed with a sword, he is to be killed with a sword" (76). Such a reading stresses the inevitability of persecution and death for the faithful. Charles argues that this appeal to loyal endurance suits the context and tone of Revelation and is supported by Jer. 15:2 and 43:11

(77). The text of Sinaiticus reads: "If anyone shall kill with the sword, he must be killed with the sword". This corresponds with Jesus' words in Matt. 26:52: "All who take the sword will perish by the sword". The first couplet, according to this reading, teaches that the believer must accept what God has ordained, and the second warns against any attempt on the part of the church to defend itself by the use of force (78). As Caird puts it, "God has given to Rome the ius gladii (cf. Rev. 2:12) for the suppression of crime and disorder and even when that authority has become corrupt it must still be obeyed (sic)" (79).

William Barclay comments as follows, "It is an intolerable paradox to defend the gospel of the love of God by using the violence of men" (80). This attitude of humble submission (not necessarily obedience, as Caird has it) is the patience and faith of the saints. Patience is steadfast endurance in the midst of persecution, and faith is the steady trust which never

wavers according to Gal. 5:22 (81).

John in this verse forewarns the believers of the endurance and fidelity which will be demanded of them in these persecutions. If captivity or martyrdom by the sword await them, they must be ready to meet these tests of their steadfastness, and not attempt to resist by force the persecutions of the beast (82).

II

11. Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλο θηρίον ἀναβαῖνον ἐκ τῆς γῆς ,

And I saw another beast coming up out of the earth,
καὶ εἶχεν κέρατα δύο ὅμοια ἀρνίῳ, καὶ ἐλάλει ὡς
and he had two horns like a lamb, and spoke as a
δράκων.
dragon.

12. καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πρώτου θηρίου πᾶσαν ποιεῖ

And he exercises all the authority of the first
ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ. καὶ ποιεῖ τὴν γῆν καὶ
beast before him. And he causes the earth and
τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ κατοικοῦντας ἵνα προσκυνήσουσιν τὸ θηρίον
those who dwell in it to worship the first beast,
τὸ πρῶτον, οὗ ἐθεραπεύθη ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ.
who death-stroke was healed.

13. καὶ ποιεῖ σημεῖα μεγάλα, ἵνα καὶ πῦρ ποιῇ ἐκ τοῦ

And he does great signs, so that he makes fire to
οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνειν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἐνώπιον τῶν
come down from heaven on the earth before (in the

ἀνθρώπων.

sight of) men.

14. καὶ πλανᾷ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς διὰ

And he deceives those dwelling on the earth by

τα σημεῖα ἃ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ

means of the signs which were given to do before

θηρίου, λέγων τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ποιῆσαι

(in the sight of) the beast, telling those dwell-

εἰκόνα τῷ θηρίῳ ὃς ἔχει τὴν πληγὴν τῆς μαχαίρης

ing on the earth to make an image to the beast, who

καὶ ἔζησεν.

has the stroke of the sword and lived (again).

15. καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ δοῦναι πνεῦμα τῇ εἰκόνι τοῦ θηρίου,

And it was given unto him to give spirit to the image

ἵνα καὶ λαλήσῃ ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ θηρίου καὶ ποιήσῃ [ἵνα]

of the beast, in order that the image of the beast

ὅσοι ἐὰν μὴ προσκυνήσωσιν τῇ εἰκόνι τοῦ

might speak, and cause that as many as would not

θηρίου ἀποκτανθῶσιν.

worship the image of the beast should be killed.

16. καὶ ποιεῖ πάντας, τοὺς μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς μεγάλους, καὶ

And he makes everyone, the small and the great, both

τοὺς πλουσίους καὶ τοὺς πτωχοὺς, καὶ τοὺς ἐλευθέρους

the rich and the poor, the free and the slaves, to

καὶ τοὺς δούλους, ἵνα δώσιν αὐτοῖς χάραγμα ἐπὶ τῆς

receive a mark on their right hand or on their fore-

χειρὸς αὐτῶν τῆς δεξιᾶς ἢ ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον αὐτῶν,

heads,

καὶ ἵνα μή τις δύνηται ἀγοράσαι ἢ πλῶρῃσαι εἰ μὴ
 and no one was allowed to buy or sell except those
 ὁ ἔχων τὸ χάραγμα, τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θηρίου ἢ τὸν ἀριθμὸν
 having the mark, either the name of the beast or
 τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ.
 the number of his name.

18. Ὡςδε ἡ σοφία ἐστίν· ὁ ἔχων νοῦν ψηφισάτω

Here is wisdom. Let the one who has understanding
 τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ θηρίου, ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου
 count the number of the beast; For it is the
 ἐστίν. καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ ἑξακόσιοι
 number of a man. And his number is six hundred
 ἑξήκοντα ἕξ.
 and sixty-six.

Perhaps it would be better, in the light of Austin Farrer's observation that the argument in Revelation is the type where "nothing short of the whole story proves the case" (83), to reserve our identification of the second beast until our exegesis of the text makes such an identification possible:

11. The second beast came up out of the earth. He had two horns like a lamb, and spoke like a dragon. According to 1 Enoch 60:7-10 the female monster, Leviathan, lived "in the abysses of the ocean" like the first beast of Rev. 13, while Behemoth, the male lived in a "waste wilderness named Duidain" (84). John may have been using these well-known Apocalyptic images, adapting them to suit his own purposes. Beasley-Murray notes that both the figures

of Leviathan and Behemoth are linked with primeval beginnings and the end of history, a fact which made it easy for John to adapt them to political and religious figures of his time who were allowing themselves to become Satanic institutions and to play an antigod role in the eschaton (85).

The beast from the earth, although its two horns gave it the appearance of a lamb, is revealed as a dragon by its speech. In modern idiom, it is a wolve in sheep's clothes. The term "beast" is applied to this second monster only in this present verse. In the more than thirty times that the term "the beast" is used elsewhere in the Apocalypse it always refers to the first beast, the figure of Rev. 13:1-8. The second beast is elsewhere uniformly called "the false prophet" (Rev. 16:13; 19:20; 20:10). The two horns like a lamb represent his attempt to convey the impression of gentle harmlessness (86) and reminds us of Jesus' warning in Matt. 7:15: "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravenous wolves". It is unlikely that the two horns are intended to contrast with or be an imitation of the Lamb of God in Rev. 5:6ff., as Beasley-Murray and Caird contend (87). Mounce is correct in noting that in the parody that runs throughout this section it is the first, and not the second, beast who corresponds to the Lamb of God (88). That the beast speaks as

a dragon may mean, as Swete suggests, that he speaks with the roar of a dragon (89). Mounce, however, interprets the expression to mean that, as the serpent in Eden, the beast's speech is deceitful and beguiling (90). R.H. Charles says that he can make nothing of this clause and argues that the present text is a corruption of the original Hebrew which probably read, "But he was a destroyer like the dragon" (91). Each of these interpretations affirms the essential information contained in the text, namely that the beast is a deceiver (cf. 13:14) just like his master, the dragon.

12. This second beast exercises all the authority of the first beast before him. And he makes the earth and its inhabitants worship the first beast, whose mortal wound was healed.

F.F. Bruce notes (92) that as Christ receives authority from the Father (Matt. 11:27) so the Antichrist receives authority from the dragon (Rev. 13:14), and as the Holy Spirit glorifies Christ (John 16:14) so the false prophet glorifies the Antichrist (Rev. 13:12). As the dragon gave his authority to the first beast (13:4), so the second beast exercises the authority of the first. Both beasts are in the service of the dragon. As the prophet Elijah in 1 Kings 17:1 stands before God speaking a word of authority on God's behalf, so the false prophet carries out the desires of the first beast (93).

The role and purpose of the second beast is to bring all mankind to give religious veneration to the first beast, whose mortal wound was healed. Some writers who interpret the mortal wound as a reference to the Nero Redivivus legend find it necessary to point out that here and in verse 14 the beast is to be identified with the head impersonating him (94). Mounce is perfectly right, however, in suggesting that the beast himself must be seen as having recovered rather than just that head which was wounded. The first beast with the healed wound denotes, according to Beasley-Murray, here the Antichrist as the embodiment of the anti-christian empire (95). In view of the task and purpose of the second beast in this verse, there can be little doubt that this earthmonster is to be identified with the promoters of the emperor-cult (96), the Asiarchs of whom we read in Acts 19:31 (97). Oscar Cullmann interprets the second beast more broadly as "the religio-ideological propaganda authority of the totalitarian state" (98). This "propaganda authority" was spearheaded in Asia Minor by the "Commune of Asia", a council made up of representatives from the chief cities of the province whose members were called Asiarchs (99). These promoters of emperor worship are merely the servants of the first beast, the Roman state, from whom they derive their powers, and their office is the enforcement

of the worship of their master.

13. The second beast works great miracles, even making fire come down from heaven to earth in the sight of men. It appears as if the working of miracles by a false Christ was part and parcel of the Antichrist tradition. According to 2 Thessalonians 2:9, "the coming of the lawless one by the activity of Satan will be with all power and with pretended signs and wonders" (cf, also Ascension of Isaiah 4:10; 2 Esdras 5:4; Sibeline Oracles 3:63ff.). John may have had in mind the warning against false prophets in Deuteronomy 13:1-2 when he transferred the working of miracles from the Antichrist to the false prophet (100). John has already said in the previous verse that the second beast exercises all the authority of the first beast. By means of signs and wonders which flow from this demonic authority, the false prophet deceives people into worshipping the first beast. Like Elijah in 1 Kings 18:36-39 and 2 Kings 1:10 the false prophet calls down fire from heaven in the sight of men. The false prophet fulfills the prediction of Jesus in Mark 13:22: "false Christs and false prophets will arise and show signs and wonders, to lead astray, if possible, the elect".
14. "and by the signs which it is allowed to work before the beast, it deceives those who dwell on earth, bidding them make an image for the beast which was

wounded by the sword and yet lived".

According to F.F. Bruce the false prophet (i.e. the priesthood of the emperor-cult) is the Antichrist's "Minister of Propaganda" (101). John uses the expression "those who dwell on the earth" to refer to the entire body of unregenerated mankind (102), the unbelieving world (103), as is clear from its occurrence in Rev. 6:10 and 11:10. In Rev. 13:8 and 17:8 they are explicitly identified as those whose names are not written in the book of life. John believes that the faithful, who have received the mark of God on their foreheads, have in this way been secured against the Antichrist's deception and temptation (cf. Rev. 7:4-8; 9:4). "Those who dwell on the earth", namely the unbelieving world, who have received the mark of the beast, are inevitably to become victims of deceit and temptation (104).

William Barclay notes that everywhere in Asia were images and statues of the emperor in the presence of which the official acts of worship were carried out (105), a fact which is meant to account for the performance of signs "in the presence of the beast". R.H. Charles, however, interprets this phrase as indicating that the priesthood performed the signs before the official representative of the empire (106). Charles' interpretation may be true in light of the fact that the making of an image is referred to in the second half of the same

verse. The false miracles by which the monster deceives the people could be either the tricks used by magicians and ventriloquists in service of a fake religion (107), or genuine manifestations of demonic power derived from Satan (108). John most likely had in mind the former, as he is here dealing with emperor worship and not black magic. The priesthood of the emperor-cult (second beast) instructs its followers to make an image of the beast who survived its mortal wound. The reference is probably to a bust statue of Nero (109). According to the Ascension of Isaiah 4:11 the Antichrist is to set up his image in every city. Caligula's death alone prevented him from erecting his statue in the Jewish Temple (110).

15. "And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed". R.H. Charles cites a number of ancient texts from non-biblical sources to show that legends of speaking and wonderworking images were plentiful in the ancient world (111). Simon Magus, for instance, is reputed to have brought statues to life (112). Magic and ventriloquism conceivably made such "miracles" common, but Christians regarded these as effected by demonic power. The syntax of verse 15 suggests that the image passed the death-sentence

on all who would not worship it. Morris wisely suggests a change of subject so that it would be the second beast who is the enforcer of the image worship (113). Whatever the case is, the outcome is the same. Mankind is divided into two groups: those who will remain loyal to the faith even in the face of death, and those who will worship the Antichrist. Nominal and halfhearted Christians will not surrender their lives for a cause in which they do not really believe (114). Mounce cites Pliny's letter to Trajan 10:96 to show that in Trajan's day failure to worship was a capital offence, which decisively disproves Caird's position that John is here referring to the legal status of Christians rather than to their actual fate (115).

16. "And he causes everyone, both small and great, both rich and the poor, both the free persons and the slaves, to receive a mark on their right hand or on their foreheads". The coupling of opposites in the first part of this verse is a rhetorical way of emphasizing the universality of the beast's onslaught (cf. Rev. 11:18; 19:5, 18; 20:12). The origin of the mark of the beast on the right hand or forehead is explained differently by scholars. Apart from instances where, as a sign of disgrace, disobedient slaves and defeated soldiers were branded, Mounce cites from Lucian and Herodotus to show that religious tattooing was widespread in

the ancient world, and devotees of a particular god was often branded to indicate their loyal devotion (116). According to 3 Maccabees 2:29 Ptolemy Philopater branded Jews who submitted to registration with the ivy leaf, the Mark of Dionysiac worship.

Χάραγμα was also used for the head or superscription of the emperor on Roman coins. Caird takes this as the reason for the mark being placed on the hand as well as the forehead in the present verse (117). According to Deissmann Χάραγμα was also a technical designation for the seals on commercial documents which were stamped with the name and the date of the emperor (118). Many scholars see a reference to the Jewish custom of wearing phylacteries on the left hand and on the forehead and as referred to in Deut. 6:8 (119). W.M. Ramsay takes the passage as an apocalyptic description of certificates issued to those who had fulfilled the ceremonial obligations of emperor worship (120). Preston and Hanson see a reference to the "X" in Christ's name in Greek and suggest that the mark of the beast was a parody of the practice of making the sign of the cross on the forehead of the new Christian (121). We can agree with Caird that John's symbolism here was "probably compounded of many remembered elements" (122).

Whatever the precise background or origin of the symbolism, its significance in the present verse is

a parody of the sealing of the servants of God in Rev. 7. Just as the elect are sealed upon their foreheads to escape the imminent destruction of the earth, so the followers of the beast are to escape his wrath against the church by bearing his mark (123). In John's vision the mark is obviously visible. It symbolizes allegiance to the demands of the imperial cult. Only those who would rather die than compromise their faith will resist the mark of the Antichrist and this will be the ultimate test of religious loyalty (124). The Apostle Paul draws on the same idea in Gal. 5:17 where the "marks of Jesus", which indicated that Paul was his slave, are scars of physical sufferings for Christ's sake.

17. "and no one was allowed to buy or sell except those having the mark, either the name of the beast or the number of his name". Apart from identifying those who were servants of the beast, the mark also served as a sign that those who bore it were allowed to engage in everyday commercial transactions. The most obvious interpretation here is that verse 17 contains an allusion to the contemporary historical situation in which those who refused to worship the beast or bear its mark were harassed by an economic boycott in order to force them to submit to emperor-worship. A.Y. Collins, following Caird and Charles, denies that an economic warfare was waged by the State against the Christians at all. He as-

serts that buying and selling with coins which bore the image and name of the current emperor made the Christians refuse to use the coins (125). This interpretation appears to the present writer as reading into the text of verses 16 and 17 ideas that are not obviously expressed there. Collins is over-eager to posit Zealot tendencies for John. Although some Jewish Christians may have entertained such sentiments it is not likely that all the elect would have felt that way.

Mounce argues that it is not a matter of the name or the number of the beast which is stamped on the followers. Rather, the mark is the number of the name according to the syntax (126).

18. "This calls for wisdom: let him who has understanding reckon the number of the beast, for it is a human number, its number is six hundred and sixty-six". The Jews used to practice gematria according to which letters of the alphabet served as numbers (127). The writer to the Church in Asia, in order to avoid a charge of sedition, had to be secretive about the identity of the beast, but he is here offering a clue which would have been understood by the discerning people among his readership who were familiar with gematria. In our present verse the number of the beast is 666 (or 616 according to some ancient manuscripts). Here it is further made clear that the number "represents a man's name" (NEB), it

refers to a definite historical person. It is not our purpose here to review the numerous conjectures that scholars have offered through the ages about the meaning of the number. John felt certain that the earliest recipient of his letter would be able to decipher his meaning. The issues which he is discussing were burning enough to make his meaning obvious to his readers in Asia Minor. Unfortunately the elapse of almost nineteen hundred years since the writing of Revelation has obscured the meaning to the extent that scholars still hotly debate whether John was referring to Nero redivivus or to some other Caesar (128).

III

Now that we have looked in some detail at the argument of Rev. 13, we may draw some conclusions as to the author's view of the State.

John sees the State, the Roman Empire of his time, as the Antichrist, the henchman of Satan, who is set to win the allegiance of his subjects for the Devil. The State blasphemes God, is at war with the Church, and claims the worship of its subjects. The priestly agency of the emperor-cult is an instrument of propaganda for the demonic State. Beasley-Murray sees Satan, the Roman State, and the priesthood of the emperor cult as forming a kind of trinity of evil, demanding that which belongs to the true God only, namely worship (129). Throughout this negative evaluation of the State the message

runs clearly that the elect must remain steadfast and not surrender to the demonic demands and pressures of the State. The Christian must resist and refuse to render to Caesar that which belongs to God, even if it means death or ostracism for them. The State is not seen as permanent, but is allowed by God to hold power for a certain time before it will be destroyed along with its Master, the Devil, and those who surrendered to them.

As far as the behaviour of the church is concerned in a situation of alienation from the ruling power, no reference is made of revolution or any form of violent resistance to the State. The option which is advocated is one of passive resistance. A.Y. Collins notes that the mythic pattern of combat which is used in Dan. 7 and the Assumption of Moses, is also employed in Revelation to depict the religio-political conflict in which the Christians of Asia Minor were involvement in the last decade of the first century C.E. (130). The community was seen as being in the midst of a dualistic cosmic struggle. The ancient combat myth involving the struggle between the forces of creation and chaos is used to interpret the situation confronting the community. This holy war imagery is used in such a way as to encourage a passive acceptance of suffering in view of the expected eschatological conflict, when the elect will be rescued and rewarded for their martyrdom (cf. Rev. 14). In the narrative of Rev. 12, where the

woman and the child are rescued from the attacks of the adversary, the story does not advocate active resistance or self-defence, but rather awakens trust in the power of heaven to protect and rescue (131). In Rev. 13 images from Dan. 7 and 8 are adapted to depict the Roman Empire as the beast of chaos who rebels against God himself (132). This rebellion against God includes hostile actions towards the Christians (13:7). In 13:10 the elect are advised to endure the suffering and to show their faith by waiting for the destruction of the oppressive power in the eschatological conflict. Again, in Rev. 19:11-16 Christ appears with the heavenly armies to defeat the beast and his allies. In 20:1-3 Satan is bound by an angel, and in 20:7-10 the last resurgence of chaos is crushed by fire from heaven. Rev. 17:14 does hint that the elect, the followers of the Lamb, might have an active role in the eschatological battle by the words, "and those with him (the Lamb) are called and chosen and faithful". Collins is doubtlessly right in asserting that "those with him" refers here to the human followers of Jesus and not to angels (133). The author does not make it clear, however, as to whether the Christians are meant to be participants in the victory of the Lamb only, or also participants in the battle. Neither is it clear whether "those with him" are involved in the battle here on earth or only posthumously. Collins argues cogently that the dominant conception in the final holy war is that the people will

participate in the new order brought along by the eschatological battle, but not in the battle itself

(134). For John the eschatological battle is to be an act of divine vengeance for the blood of the martyrs and judgment on the oppressors of the people (135).

Martyrdom is seen as a deed which helps bring about the end and the Kingdom, and for this reason it is especially rewarded (136). The stance which Christians are advised to take is to endure persecution and death and to hope for ultimate salvation (cf. Rev. 2:10; 13:10).

According to Rev. 6:9-11 the death of each martyr brings the eschaton nearer. This desire for vengeance on enemies and for a special reward are very prominent elements of the idea of martyrdom in Revelation (137). Also very important for the martyrdom theology of Revelation is the example of Christ who died and is alive (1:17-18; 2:8, 10; 12:11; 20:4-6).

A.Y. Collins makes a rather surprising and a sweeping statement concerning John's attitude to the Roman state:

"The fact that the author chose to write an apocalypse and one which involves such a thorough-going attack on the authority of Rome is an indication that he shared the fundamental theological principle of the Zealots: that the kingdom of God is incompatible with the kingdom of Caesar" (138).

Collins here is certainly going beyond the evidence: Implicit in Revelation is a rejection of the idolatrous demands made by the State and its oppression of those

who would not worship Caesar. Certainly the emperor worship is seen as incompatible with the rule and worship of God. But no indication is given that the State or kingdom of Caesar is rejected in principle by John in the same way in which the Zealots rejected foreign rule. One could safely say that it is not so much the authority of Rome which is questioned and rejected as the abuse and perverted use of that authority.

In Revelation we have an example of civil religion, says Frank Stagg, an example of a situation where a political structure assumes the dimensions of religion. He contends that the church is practicing civil religion whenever it yields to the State what belongs to God alone (139). And he is perfectly right. It is recognized, of course, that authentic Christian discipleship compels responsible engagement with the world, but there are limits to engagement as well as limits to submission to the civil authorities. The claim of God must take priority over every other claim, else he is not God (140). Apart from being a matter of giving God his due, this principle involves man's own personhood. Even though it is unlikely that the early Christians would have accepted our present sense of personal autonomy, their standpoint allows for our present contention that one cannot be an authentic human being if he yields ultimate claim to any other human being or a human structure. One's own integrity can grant ultimate claim to God alone, and to be truly human requires one to do

that (141). It is also imperative that the church dissociates itself from all ideologies and crusades of the state. Aleksandr Solzhenitzyn stated that it is when a state identifies itself with an ideology that its evil becomes unbounded. Because of its ideology, the state believes that whatever it does is good (142). The church must not give any encouragement to the fallacy and arrogance of any state which sees itself as good incarnate, as opposed to the so-called "enemy" which is seen as the embodiment of absolute evil (143).

Closely bound up with civil religion (or religious nationalism) is the concept of theocracy. When a nation sees itself as in a special or exclusive sense under the direct rule of God, it becomes idolatrous civil religion. Whatever it does it justifies theologically as proper to a nation under God's rule. In this way religion becomes the tool of the state, which is in fact man's idolatrous worship of himself as God (144). The church dare not confuse nation with God.

Now the refusal to render Caesar that which belongs to God rest in the first place on the Christian's belief in monotheism. Stagg writes:

"..nonegotiable monotheism is the biblical base for rendering back to God what belongs to God. It is the biblical base for Christian disengagement from the world when world tries to be God or another alongside God. Religion is nothing more than civil religion when it fails in commitment to God alone,

besides whom there must be no other gods. Religion which sees Caesar as God's peer is civil religion. It is idolatrous, worshipping a fallible human structure as though it were God. Religion which equates "God and country" is idolatrous civil religion. Religion which flies any single country's flag alongside the banner of Christ is either naively simple or blatantly idolatrous. Alongside the banner of Christ are to fly the flags of all nations or of no nation" (145).

We cannot but wholeheartedly agree with Stagg. Of course people in our day no longer blatantly worship the king or president or prime minister or the person of Caesar, but in much more subtle fashion ideologies and political polities have become their idols. Capitalism, communism, apartheid have become the "holy cows" to which they are devoted.

The refusal to give Caesar what belongs to God, rests, in the second place, as has already been noted above, on the fact that it is not proper for a human being to look up to or down upon another human being, or to be in bondage to any human structure (146). The Bible affirms that man was created in the image of God, "thrust into freedom with the inescapable responsibility of conscience. God himself chose not to coerce man. Let no pseudo-god deny any man the freedom of conscience granted man in creation and pre-

served in redemption. When Caesar makes ultimate claims upon man, Caesar not only presumes to be God but denies to man what God gave man. Out of conscience the Christian is to render to Caesar what belongs to Caesar, but there is nothing contrary to conscience which rightfully belongs to Caesar. The conscience which gives may be the conscience which finds that it must withhold"(147).

Once again Stagg is here hitting the nail on the head. Paul, in Rom. 13, admonishes everyone to submit to the state out of conscience. The same conscience under different circumstances compells the writer of Revelation to refuse submission the state and to dissociate from the civil religion which offered the sanction of religion to the beastliness of the state.

The war on the northern border of Namibia highlights the issue on conscience in South Africa today. Young people are commanded to fight in a war which many believe to be wrong. The saddest part is that much of the church is silent or openly supportive of the war, but unsupportive of young conscientious objectors. It fails to recognize the priority of conscience over the claims of state. It is civil religion which denies the claims of conscience.

Civil disobedience is well attested and quite prominent and explicit in the Bible, especially in the Old Testament (148). The Book of Revelation was in a sense written in support of civil disobedience. Un-

like violent revolution against government, civil disobedience is non-violent resistance, the refusal on grounds of conscience to comply with a requirement of civil government and the willingness to bear whatever consequences. In civil disobedience the objector refuses the claim made by the state as he answers to the higher claim of God as understood by conscience. It is to civil disobedience that John calls his readers in Revelation when he asks them not to submit to worship of the beast.

At this point something needs to be said about the prophetic role of the church to the state. Now prophets may either be true or false. True and false prophets are distinguished in the Bible chiefly by the way they relate to civil government. False prophets are found chiefly in a role uncritically supportive of the king. He is the court chaplain, whose function is to give the sanction of religion to the wishes of the monarch (149). The false prophet represents civil religion at its worse (cf. Amos 7:10-17). The true prophet speaks from God and for God (cf. Nathan, Amos, Jeremiah). It is a primary function of the prophet to speak God's word to the King. He ultimately answers to God and conscience, not to the king. So it is the proper function of religion to speak the word of God, even to the state. It is not the proper function of religion to be lectured to by the state. During Easter 1985 roles were forgotten when a certain church, at its 75th Anni-

versary, invited the President of South Africa to address their Annual Assembly. Had the political head of State been invited as an auditor, to listen to some prophetic word of God, there would have been a proper retention of roles. For the church to sit at the feet of the state is a close parallel to the subservience of the court chaplain to the king (150). The church, therefore, has to be cautious not to become the second beast, the false prophet of Rev. 13, but to remain true to her calling to speak God's unadulterated word to the state.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS

In this short final chapter of our study we shall draw the three different strands together in order to reach some conclusions concerning the New Testament perspective on Church and State.

For Christians down through the ages the ultimate State, the *πολίτευμα*, is in heaven, as Paul says in Phil. 3:20 and as the Epistle to Diognetus 5:9 states in so many words: "They pass their time upon the earth, but they have their citizenship in heaven". Christians cannot put all their hope in an earthly empire with an idealistic political social order. This, however, should not lead to an indifference towards the realities of this world, to an apolitical attitude or a ghetto-existence with political abstinence. The earthly State is seen as occupying an important place in God's present order, even if that State happens to be unChristian and unaware of being an instrument of God (1). The fact that Christians are hoping for heaven also should not lead to obstruction^{ism} or a purely^{negative} attitude towards the State. It does, however, lead to a relativism and an end to ideologizing and criticism of the absolutism of the State (2). The Christian's attitude should neither be one of opposition and disloyalty in principle, nor one of irrational, uncritical submission to the author-

ities. Rather, he will remain in principle critical towards the State exactly because he knows about the place which the State occupies in God's order, namely to be an instrument for the promotion of peace and quiet among the people.

We have seen that Jesus could ^{not} have been a member of the Zealot party simply because it came into existence after his death. We were not able, by any stretch of the imagination, to discern violent tendencies or intentions to violently overthrow the Roman government in Jesus. He rejected violence in no uncertain terms. Recognizing the position of the State as subordinate to God and instituted by God he stressed the fact that all citizens had an inescapable political responsibility to pay taxes for the benefits ^{derived} from the State, and to submit to the authority of the State in general. The Christian must, however, refuse to render to the State that which is God's or to obey the State's demands or laws which are contrary to God's will. Christians must, therefore, remain critical of the State's demands and its performance in the light of God's requirements for justice. Jesus' arrest and death resulted from his clashes with the Jewish leaders about his religious teachings, his attitude to the Law, his criticisms of them and his rejection of the social and religious structures of his day and his popularity with the ordinary people, and not because of politically subversive activities.

Paul clearly agrees with Jesus that the earthly State is God's servant, willed and appointed by God for the good of the citizens. Although for John of Revelation, the persecuting Roman State is a satanical dragon, an institution of the Devil, we have argued that ultimately the Devil himself is an instrument of God. This tension between Paul and John gives a first indication of a tendency which became a strong motif in Church-State relationships of later centuries namely that the Church's attitude to the State is largely determined by the ^{State's} treatment of the Church. John's view of the State was shaped by the emperor worship and persecuting actions of his time. Even John does not in principle reject the State as an institution, but condemns the blasphemous and ungodly stand of the ruling government of his time. It is important to note, even today, this important distinction between State as an institution (without ^{which} anarchy exists) and a specific ruling government. The "normative view" of Calvinists according to which God ordained not a particular government but the concept of government has been weighed by us and found wanting. This does not mean, however, that it is devoid of all truth. The distinction is a logical reality and the removal of a specific oppressive and unjust government does not necessarily mean that the people responsible are against the State as an institution. The aim may not be to bring about anarchy, but to replace an unjust government with one which will be

more just in the view of the people. John of Revelation would doubtlessly be in agreement with Jesus and Paul *about* the necessity of government and *over* the obligation to pay taxes and give the authorities due respect.

Because of the eschatological beliefs of Jesus, Paul and John, none of them viewed the earthly state as a final institution and imposed definite limitations on it. Where a government exceeds its limitations and fails to comply with standards of justice the Church is under obligation to fulfil its prophetic role and warn the State against its transgressions of its legitimate limits (3), and resist and disobey the State even if it means persecution, imprisonment and death. The Church members must, however, loyally continue to give the State everything necessary for its existence, submit to any reasonable law it makes, pray for those in positions of authority and oppose anarchy and violence. Furthermore the Church must be watchman over the State and deny it any religio-ideological demands (4).

We have also noted that the New Testament characters whose political views we have discussed fail to give clear guidance on an issue such as the abuse of power or office by the governmental authorities. Paul is altogether quiet in this connection, while John of Revelation advocates civil disobedience in cases where the State makes absolute claims. Paul's reference to Christians being submissive to the government not only because of fear but also "because of conscience" (Roman 13:5), *implies*

that the same conscience which gives may at times find that it should withhold obedience (p. 96). Where the claims of the State are in conflict with the claims of God, Christians should obey God rather than the State (Acts 4:18ff.; 5:29). Even Jesus' words, "Render to Caesar what belongs to Caesar, and to God what belongs to God", implies that claims made by the State concerning the things which are God's must be refused. It is doubtful whether Jesus, Paul and John would have thought in today's individualistic terms, but their actions and words may be taken as a biblical justification by, for instance, the person who would refuse to participate in an unjust war,

The permissibility of participation by Christians in a violent revolution against the governing authorities is likewise not dealt with by Jesus, Paul and John. Jesus' general emphasis on love and his warnings against revenge and violence make his standpoint sufficiently clear. From Paul and John's silence in this regard we can legitimately deduce that they would have the same standpoint as Jesus.

Prayer for the overthrow of an unjust government may be justified on the basis of Jesus' prayer that the Kingdom of God may come. The coming of the Kingdom would inevitably mean the end of unjust rule and the overthrow of all earthly governments. Humans are, however, not seen as being instrumental in the coming of the Kingdom. We may thus safely deduce that Jesus,

Paul and John accepted the status quo in the light of their belief in the imminent eschaton. This eschatological emphasis is much less pronounced in our own day and age, so that a much greater need is felt to have politically oppressive conditions changed here and now.

Furthermore many Christians today outrightly reject the antiquated first premise of Jewish political argument that all government is from God. They live in a politically enlightened era where the clamour is for government by the people. They are also more aware of the fact that human fears and prejudices, selfishness and greed, lust for power, political scheming and manipulation play a dominant role in the coming to power of governments and take a less positive attitude towards governments. Coups d'état, tyrannical rule, racism and unjust governments have made people sceptical about any idea of divine institution of governments and it is today generally accepted that unjust governments deserve to be overthrown. This changed political viewpoint and atmosphere has no precedent in New Testament times. These facts, however, do not invalidate the New Testament writers' concern that God ought to be served in the political sphere of life. This demand to serve God in political life must be grasped in terms of today's new situation and applied to contemporary problems (5). In this application the biblical perspective which we have been studying offers us some

broad principles to use, namely that Christians should loyally give the State what it needs to exist, submit to its authority, reject violence, to resist any religio-ideological claims or injustices of the State and fulfil a prophetic role in relation to the State.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1. C.E.B. Cranfield, The Service of God (London: Epworth Press, 1965), pp. 49-50.
2. Ibid., p. 50.
3. S.G.F. Brandon, Jesus and the Zealots (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967).
4. Oscar Cullmann, The State in the New Testament (London: SCM, 1957).
5. For an historical survey of the development of the thesis proposed by Brandon see: E. Bammel, "The revolution theory from Reimarus to Brandon", Jesus and the Politics of His Day (Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 11-68.
6. D.R. Griffiths, The New Testament and the Roman State (Swansea: John Penry Press, 1970).
7. Apart from E. Bammel's article, good summaries of the positions of Reimarus and Eisler are to be found in:
Max Wilcox, "Jesus in the light of his Jewish environment", Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt II, 25.1, Religion (1982), p. 169.
J.P.M. Sweet, "The Zealots and Jesus", Jesus and the Politics of His Day (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 3-5
8. Brandon, Zealots, p. 2.
9. Ibid., p. 355.
10. Ibid., p. 57
11. Ibid., pp. 257, 263, 281.
12. Josephus, Jewish War 11.118.

13. Quoted by S.G.F. Brandon from a private letter in "Jesus and the Zealots: Aftermath", The John Rylands Library Bulletin, 54 (1971-2), p. 49.
14. Ernst Bammel, C.F.D. Moule (eds.), Jesus and the Politics of His Day (Cambridge University Press, 1984) - henceforward abbreviated JPHD: In their **Foreword** the editors do state, however, that some of the essays in their collection were completed a decade before the appearance of the book.
15. Marc Borg, "The currency of the term 'Zealot'", Journal of Theological Studies, 22 (1971). p. 511.
16. The words in brackets are those of the present writer.
17. Sicarrii are so called from the sica or curved dagger which they carried concealed in their garments to stab their victims. For a full bibliography and good description of their activities see: Emil Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in Age of Jesus, Vol. 2, Revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black (Edinburgh: T T Clarke, 1979), pp. 598-606.
18. Solomon Zeitlin, "Masada and the Sicarrii", Jewish Quarterly Review, 55 (1964), p. 316.
19. The leader of the Sicarrii was Eleazar, son of Jairus, who succeeded in Menahem.
20. Morton Smith, "Zealots and Sicarrii: Their origins and Relations", Harvard Theological Review, 64(1971), pp. 1-19.

21. J.P.M. Sweet, "The Zealots and Jesus", JPHD, p. 5.
22. John Reumann in his Introduction to Martin Hengel, Was Jesus a Revolutionist? (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), p. xiv.
23. H.A. Lombard, "Jesus en the 'Selote': 'n Oondersoek van die begrip 'ywer vir God's Koningkryk'", Theologia Evangelica, IX, No. 2.
24. See Shimon Applebaum, "The Zealots: The Case for revaluation", Journal of Roman Studies, 16 (1971), pp. 156-7.
25. Lombard, "Selote", p. 122.
26. B. Solomonsen, "Some remarks on the Zealots with special regard to the term 'Qannaim' in Rabbinic Literature", New Testament Studies, 12 (1965-6), pp. 164-76.
27. Lombard, p. 124.
28. I.H. Marshall, The Gospel of Luke (Exeter: Paternoster, 1978), p. 240.
29. C. Roth, "The Zealots - A Jewish Religious Sect", Judaism, 8 (1959), pp. 33-40.
30. Gemeindetheologie - reflection and theology which the early church reconstructed after Easter vaticania ex eventu and carried into the text.
31. Brandon, Zealots, pp. 27, 285, 310.
32. Brandon's methodology has been very thoroughly criticized by Martin Hengel in a book review in Journal of Semitic Studies, p.15; David R. Catchpole, The Trial of Jesus (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971),

- pp. 117-26.
33. Lombard, p. 126; cf. C.F.D. Moule, "Tendenzkritik", JPHD, pp. 91-100.
 34. J.D.G. Dunn, "The Messianic Secret in Mark", Tyndale Bulletin, 21 (1970), pp. 92-117. See also note 37.
 35. E. Käsemann, "The Problem of the Historical Jesus", Essays on New Testament Themes (London: SCM, 1964), pp. 37-43; as well as G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1960), pp. 169-72, 178.
 36. Cf. Oscar Cullman, State in the N.T., pp. 24-31.
Oscar Cullman, Christology of the New Testament (London: SCM, 1959), pp. 118f. Idem., Jesus and the Revolutionaries, p. 41f.
J.D.G. Dunn, "Messianic Secret", pp. 101ff.
 37. J.P.M. Sweet, "Zealots and Jesus", JPHD, p. 8
cf. also Martin Hengel, Was Jesus a Revolutionist? (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), p. 26.
D.R. Griffiths, N.T. & Roman State, p. 52.
Frank Stagg, "Rendering to Caesar What belongs to Caesar: Christian Engagement with the World:", Journal of Church and State, 18, No. 1 (Winter 1976), p. 100.
 38. D.R. Griffiths, N.T. & Roman State, p. 52.
 39. Frank Stagg, "Rendering to Caesar", p. 52.
 40. I.H. Marshall, Luke, p. 734.
 41. Ibid., p. 734.

42. Rudolf Bultman, The History of the Synoptic Tradition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963), p.26.
43. F.F. Bruce, "Render to Caesar", JPHD, p. 25.
44. D.R. Griffiths, N.T. & Roman State, p. 56
A.N. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 126.
45. Luke has substituted φορόν (tax, tribute) for Mark's κῆνσον, the latter being a loanword from Latin.
46. Bruce, "Render to Caesar", p. 254.
47. Ibid., p. 255.
48. Ibid., p. 257.
49. Ibid., p. 251.
50. Ibid., p. 251.
51. For the history and background of the Jewish tribute to Rome, see F.F. Bruce, "Render to Caesar", JPHD, p. 251ff.
52. A Greek inscription from Palmyra, dated A.D. 136/7, lays down that dues to Rome are to be paid in denarii. Ibid., p. 258.
53. I.H. Marhsall, Luke, p. 735.
54. Some Essenes and a few strictly orthodox Pharisees refused to handle or look at a coin because the human image it bore was regarded as a breech of the second Commandment. Cf. the case of Rabbi Hahum ben Simai: Bruce, "Render to Caesar", p. 259.
55. Griffiths, N.T. & Roman State, p. 58.
Bruce, "Render to Caesar", p. 259.

56. J.D.M. Derrett, Law in the New Testament (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1970), pp. 313-338.
57. Griffiths, N.T. & Roman State, pp. 58-62.
58. Marshall, Luke, p. 736.
59. F.F. Bruce, "Render to Caesar", p. 258.
60. Derrett, Law in N.T., p. 321 n. 3.
61. Note also Bruce's argument in "Render to Caesar", pp. 258f.
62. Cranfield, The Service of God, p. 50.
63. Marshall, Luke, p. 736.
64. Cranfield, Service of God, pp. 51f.
65. Bruce, "Render to Caesar", pp. 258f.
66. Derrett, Law in N.T., pp. 335f.
67. Ibid., pp. 323f.
68. Cf. F.F. Bruce. "Render to Caesar", p. 261.
69. M. Dibelius, Jesus (E.T. by C.B. Hedrick & F.C. Grant, London: 1963), p. 152. O. Cullmann, Jesus & the Revolutionaries, p. 42.
70. James Moulder, "Romans 13 and Conscientious Disobedience", Journal of Theology for Southern Africa, No. 21 (December, 1977), pp. 14f.
71. Frank Stagg, "Rendering to God what belongs to God: Christian Disengagement from the World", Journal of Church and State, 18, 2 (1976), p. 223.
72. Stagg, "Rendering to Caesar", pp. 97f.
George V. Pixley, "God's Kingdom in First Century Palestine", The Bible and Liberation: Political

and Social Hermeneutics, ed. N.K. Gottwald (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1983), pp. 381f.

73. Frank Stagg, "Rendering to Caesar", p. 98, explains Jesus' rejection of the Sadducean option as follows:

"The Roman government appointed, controlled, and deposed the Jewish high priest at will. This was civil religion, religion living by and unto the state. There is no evidence that this option tempted Jesus. He worshipped at the temple but maintained a strong tension with what he found there, as evidenced by the cleansing of the temple, recorded in all four Gospels, and by his refusal to equate the ultimate "temple of God" with the empirical temple (Matt. 26:61; John 2:19). He acknowledged Caesar's right to taxes but affirmed the prior claims of God".

74. The two schools of thought referred to here are:

(a) those who, like Reimarus, Eisler, Brandon and others regard Jesus as a Jewish patriotic rebel, and (b) those who accept the Gospel presentation of Jesus as a non-violent suffering-type of Messiah.

75. Griffiths, N.T. and Roman State, p. 65.

76. It was written in A.D. 51-2, according to E. Best, Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians (London: A. & C. Black, 1972), pp. 7f.

77. Brandon, Zealots, p. 11 n. 3.
78. G.V. Pixley, "God's Kingdom", pp. 378ff.
79. Ibid., p. 392. Pixley states that what he has said is no more than suggestive.
80. Ibid., p. 385.
81. C.A. Wanamaker, "Jesus: A Disturber of Uneasy Peace" (An as yet unpublished paper obtainable from The Religious Studies Department, University of Cape Town.).
82. Ibid., p.2.
83. Ibid., p. 15f.
84. Cullmann, State in N.T., p. 45. Jesus & Revolutionaries, pp. 33f.
85. Griffiths, N.T. & Roman State, p. 66.
86. W.F. Howard, "John", Interpreter's Bible (Nashville: Abingdon, 1952), p. 757.
87. C.K. Barrett, The Gospel according to St. John (London: S.P.C.K., 1955), p. 433.
88. David R. Catchpole, The Trial of Jesus (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971), p. 149.
89. Catchpole correctly rejects Bultman's suggestion that Mark 14:48 sounds like church apologetic and dogmatics on the basis that this is not enough reason to dismiss a saying whose liability to misunderstanding about the political role of Jesus is sufficient authentication; Trial of Jesus, p. 149.
90. J. Blinzler, The Trial of Jesus (Westminster, Maryland Newman Press, 1959).

91. Catchpole, Trial of Jesus, p. 151.
92. K. Schubert, "Biblical Criticism critized: with reference to the Markan report of Jesus's examination before the Sanhedrin", JPHD, p. 391.
93. C.E.B. Cranfield, The Gospel according to St. Mark (Cambridge, 1966), p. 440.
Cullmann, State in N.T., pp. 27, 42, 46.
William L. Lane, Commentary on the Gospel of Mark (Grand Rapids/London, 1974), p. 530.
94. Cranfield, Mark, p. 440.
95. Schubert, "Biblical Criticism", p. 392f.
96. Pixley, "God's Kingdom", p. 389, observes further that apart from this economic dependence of many on the Temple, an even larger group was physically and culturally dependent on the Temple for national identity.
97. Our contention is that Jesus did not so much desire the physical destruction of the Temple, but the dismantling of the exploitation and oppressive economic system in existence there, so that the Temple should become a house of prayer instead of a "den of robbers" (Jn. 2:16; Mk. 11:17f.; Matt. 21:13f.; Lk. 19:46f.).
98. Pixley, "God's Kingdom", p. 384.
99. Brandon, Zealots, p. 251.
100. Pixley, "God's Kingdom", p. 383.
101. K. Schubert, "Biblical Criticism", p. 398.
102. David Flusser, The Trial and Death of Jesus of

Nazareth (London: SCM, 1969), p. 211. Cf. also Catchpole's contention in Trial of Jesus, p. 131, that no evidence can be found to suggest that the trial of Jesus hinged on his alleged "threat" to destroy the Temple.

103. G.D. Kilpatrick, The Trial of Jesus (Oxford: Driblishu 1953), pp. 13-16, also argues, we believe quite mistakenly, that the temple saying was the crux for the Jewish court and that the subsequent interrogation about Messiahship aimed simply at formulating a charge which would convince Pilate.

The present writer believes that the temple saying was an initial and roundabout attempt to get at Jesus' suspected Messiahship claim. This "Temple-destruction" allegation was subordinate and secondary to the Messiahship which was connected to the Son of God question in a way unfortunately lost to us. The combined Messiah and Son of God claim, which would not necessarily be blasphemy was in Jesus' case construed as "blasphemy" by the biased, prejudiced Sanhedrin - a wicked "frame-up".

104. Matthew has: "I am able to...." - δύναμαι καταλῦσαι.
Mark renders it, "I will destroy" - ἐγὼ καταλύσω.

105. Barrett, John, p. 164.

106. Eduard Schweizer, The Good News to Mark (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1970), p. 267.

107. Cranfield, Mark, p. 442.

108. Vincent Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark

(London: MacMillan & Co., 1957), p. 566.

109. Cranfield, Mark, p. 442.

Catchpole, Trial of Jesus, p. 130.

Taylor, Mark, p. 566.

All these scholars attest that the "three days" is indefinite and stands for "a short while".

110. Catchpole, Trial of Jesus, p. 128.

Schubert, "Biblical Criticism", p. 398.

J.C. O'Neill, "The Charge of Blasphemy at Jesus' Trial before the Sanhedrin", The Trial of Jesus, ed. E. Bammel (London: SCM, 1970), p. 75.

V. Taylor, Mark, p. 567.

111. Catchpole, Trial of Jesus, p. 132.

O'Neill, "Blasphemy", p. 72f.

112. Catchpole, Trial of Jesus, p. 86ff.

Taylor, Mark, p. 228.

113. Catchpole, Trial of Jesus, pp. 126-148.

114. Ibid., p. 148.

115. O'Neill, "Blasphemy", p. 72.

116. Ibid., pp. 72-77.

117. Catchpole, Trial of Jesus, p. 148.

118. Schubert, "Biblical Criticism", pp. 385-402.

119. Ibid., p. 399.

120. Ibid., p. 399f.

121. Ibid., pp. 400f.

122. S. Zeitlin, "The Crucifixion of Jesus Re-examined",

Jewish Quarterly Review, 31 (1941), pp. 409-

369.

123. Catchpole, Trial of Jesus, p. 96.

124. See note 37 above.

125. Schubert, "Biblical Criticism", p. 395.

126. Dunn, "Messianic Secret", p. 106.

127. Cullmann, State in N.T., p. 27.

128. Schubert, "Biblical Criticism", p. 395.

129. According to Mark 14:62 Jesus replied, ἐγώ εἰμι
while Matt. 26.64 renders his reply, σὺ εἶπας .
Luke 22:70 has ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι . There is
good reason to think that Mark originally had σὺ εἶπας
ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι . This reading is well attested
(Θ fam. 13 472 543 565 700 1071 geo arm Or): it
would account for the text of Matt. and Luke; and
it would illustrate the note of reserve about Mes-
siahship characteristic of Mark. V. Taylor, Mark,
p. 568.

The form of expression is not a direct affirmation.
Neither is it a denial. It is a kind of grudging
admission with the suggestion that the speaker
would put it otherwise or that the questioners fail
to understand exactly what they are asking. Marshall,
Luke, p. 851.

130. Wanamaker, "Disturber", p. 20.

131. Gerhard Schneider, "The political charge against
Jesus (Luke 23:2)", JPHD, p. 408.

132. Griffiths, N.T. & Roman State, p. 70f.

133. Brandon, Zealots, p. 68f.

134. C.F.D. Moule, "Some observations on Tendenzkritik",

JPHD, p. 96.

135. A.N. Sherwin-White, The Trial of Christ: Historicity and Chronology in the New Testament (London: S.P.C.K., 1965), p. 112.
136. Gary B. Miles & Garry Trompf, "Luke and Antiphon: The Theology of Acts 27-28", Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 69 (1976), pp. 259-67.
137. E. Bammel, "The Titulus", JPHD, p. 354.
138. Ibid., p. 357.
139. Ibid., p. 357 n. 28.
140. Ibid., p. 357.
141. Ibid., p. 358.
142. Ibid., p. 360.
143. Ibid., p. 363.
144. Paul Winter, On the Trial of Jesus (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1961), p. 109.
145. Bammel, "Titulus", p. 364.
146. Wanamaker, "Disturber", pp. 10f.
147. Albert Nolan, Jesus before Christianity; pp. 46f., cogently argues that the mistranslation of Luke 17: 21 - "The Kingdom of God is within you" - should read "The Kingdom of God is among you or in your midst".
148. C. Wanamaker independently from Nolan reaches the same conclusions as the latter in his rationalisations of how the healing activities and exorcisms of Jesus tied in with his message about the Kingdom. Wanamaker, "Disturber", pp. 10f.; Nolan, Jesus before Christianity, pp. 30ff.

149. Nolan, Jesus before Christianity; p. 95.
150. J.L. Segundom, "Capitalism - Socialism: A Theological Crux", Concilium, (January 1974), p. 118.
151. Nolan, "Jesus before Christianity", p. 110; Pixley, "God's Kingdom", p. 389.
152. Nolan, "Jesus before Christianity", p. 111.
153. Wanamaker, "Disturber", p. 19; Nolan, "Jesus before Christianity", p. 102.
154. Brandon, Zealots, pp. 331-336, 350f.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

1. Ernst Bammel, "Romans 13", Jesus and the Politics of His Day, p. 381.
2. C. Villa-Vicencio, Unisa Study Guide on Biblical Ethics, 1(1979), p. 114.
3. Wolfgang Schrage, Die Christen und der Staat nach dem Neuen Testament (Güthersloher: Gerd Mohn, 1970), p. 50.
4. Frank Stagg, "Rendering to Caesar", p. 104.
5. Villa-Vicencio, Study Guide, p. 114.
.. Cf. Nigel Turner, "The Church's Attitude to the State in the New Testament", Journal of Theology for Southern Africa, 2 (1973), p. 43.
6. James Moulder points to Paul's refusal to be released from prison in Acts 16:37 and correctly asserts that it is a classic example of insubordination and conscientious disobedience because of a moral conviction: Moulder, "Romans 13 and Conscientious Disobedience", Journal of Theology for Southern Africa, 21 (1977), pp. 15f.
7. J. Kallas, "Romans XIII: 1-7: An Interpolation", New Testament Studies, 11 (1964-5), pp. 365-374, presents the case for inauthenticity most competently and strongly.
Winsome Munro, Authority in Paul and Peter, SNTS Monograph Series 45 (Cambridge: 1983), p. 3, argues that the "subjection material" in the New

Testament does not belong with the more primitive, eschatological strata of tradition, but was introduced later, probably in the first half of the second century.

J.C. O'Neill, Paul's Letter to the Romans (London: 1975), p. 21, argues for inauthenticity in the strongest terms, calling the passage "hateful", and on p. 209 states that "These seven verses have caused more unhappiness and misery in the Christian East and West than any other seven verses in the New Testament". He understands the pericope as counselling absolute obedience to ruling authority in the State (p.210).

8. F.F. Bruce, "Paul and 'The Powers that Be'", Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester, Vol. 66. (1984) pp. 78-98.

C.E.B. Cranfield, The Epistle to the Romans, Vol.11 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979), pp. 651-4.

Ernst Käsemann, Commentary on Romans (London: SCM, 1980), pp. 351-4.

9. Bruce, "Powers that Be", p. 85.
10. Schrage, Christen und Staat, p. 51.
Villa-Vicencio, Study Guide, p. 115.
11. When further on in this section the author speaks about Rom. 13 he will in fact be referring to Rom. 13:1-7 in particular.

12. A.B. Ogle, "What is left for Caesar?", Theology Today, 35 (1978-9), pp. 254-64.

13. Ibid., p. 260.
14. Oscar Cullmann, Christ and Time (london: SCM 1951), pp. 191-210-
Oscar Cullmann, State in the N.T., pp. 50-70.
15. Cullmann, Christ & Time, p. 194. The conviction that ἐξουσία is a double reference to the State and angelic powers was held by outstanding scholars such as M. Dibelius (who later abandoned it), K.L. Schmidt, the idea in his Commentary on Romans, 2, p. 659. Cranfield summarizes very helpfully the arguments for and against the "double reference" of ἐξουσία, pp. 656-9.
16. O. Cullmann, State in N.T., p. 70n, and Bruce, "Powers that Be", p. 89. are convinced that the relevant passages in the Pastoral Epistles and 1 Peter are the earliest commentaries on Rom. 13:1-7, while E. Bammel, "Romans 13", p. 366, follows D. Daube in positing that instead of deriving from Rom. 13, 1 Peter 2:13 used the same source as Rom. 13. This third tradition has left its imprint on both these texts. whatever the case is, the parallel passages to Rom. 13 clearly understand the "authorities" as human rulers.
17. James Luther Garrett, Jr, in an Editorial to the Journal of Church and State entitled, "The Dialectic of Romans 13:1-7 and Revelation 13: Part One", 18 (1976), pp. 433-442, provides us with a helpful and informative history of the interpre-

tation of Rom. 13:1-7 from Origen through^{to} C.K. Barrett. Charles Villa-Vicencio's overview of opinions on Rom. 13:1-7 supplements Garret's work very well in supplying us with a spectrum of the approaches adopted by commentators in an attempt to explain Paul's standpoint in our pericope:

"Paul and the State", Study Guide, pp. 116-127.

18. J.L. Garrett, "Dialectic", p. 435.
19. Bammel, "Rom 13", pp. 367, 375.
20. J.L. Garrett, "Dialectic", p. 436.
21. W. Sanday & A. Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1895), pp. 370f.
22. F.F. Bruce, Romans (Leicester: Intervarsity Press, 1963), p. 232.
23. Villa-Vicencio, Study Guide, p. 115.
24. Bruce, "Powers that Be", p. 85.
25. Marcus Borg, "A New Context for Rom XII", New Testament Studies, 19(1973), pp. 205-218.
26. Marcus Borg writes as follows, "Under the three emperors prior to the time Paul wrote Romans, Roman Jews suffered expulsion under Tiberius in A.D. 19, twelve years of anti-Semitic policy in Italy under Tiberius' closest adviser Sejanus, the threat of annihilation through the insane hatred of Caligula, and the inconsistent policies of Claudius, who expelled them again in A.D. 49. Their exile apparently lasted five years until the beginning of the reign of Nero, only one to five years before

Paul wrote to Rome", "New Context", p. 210.

27. In Palestine during the forties and fifties under the procurators Fadus (A.D. 44-6) and Tiberius Alexander (A.D. 46-8), several Jewish revolutionary leaders were executed, thousands of Jews were killed at Passover following an insulting gesture by a Roman soldier on the roof of the temple. Cumanus (A.D. 48-52) and Felix (A.D. 52-60) crucified a number of revolutionaries and were engaged in armed battle against many others: Borg, "New Context", p. 211.

28. Scholars tend to agree that Chrestus should read Christus (Messiah). Tertullian (Apol. 3) refers to the tendency of Roman emperors to pronounce the "i" of Christianus as an "e".

29. Many church members became Christians after having been proselytes to Judaism. This Jewish connection probably continued to play a role in their lives. There was a large number of Jewish Christians in the Roman church. There was also a continuing relationship with non-Christian Jews through families, friends and commercial relationships. Jewish Christians were expelled with the rest of the Jewish community. The Romans regarded Christianity as a Jewish sect, anyway: Borg, "New Context", p. 213.

30. Ibid., p. 214.

31. Ibid., p. 215.

32. Ibid., p. 218.
33. Villa-Vicencio, Study Guide, p. 120.
34. S. Hutchinson, "The Political Implications of Rom. 13:1-7", Biblical Theology, Vol. 21 (1971), p. 50.
35. James Moulder, "Conscientious Disobedience", pp. 17ff.
36. John H. Yoder, The Politics of Jesus (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1972), p. 195. The contention of Borg, Minear, Moulder, Yoder and others that Rom. 13:1-7 was not intended to prescribe abiding principles is shared also by E. Käsemann, who argues that the New testament is not the first Christian "dogmatic theology", but a collection of occasional writings and individual tracts, with no logical ethical system designed to be normative for all Christian behaviour. He argues that Rom. 13:1-7 is not didactic as if the parenesis were a conclusion from a particular thesis. The particular situation is important and Paul's argument is addressed specifically to that situation without any thought necessarily given beyond that situation: "Principles of the Interpretation of Rom. 13", N.T. Questions of Today (London: SCM, 1969), pp. 196-216.
37. E. Bammel, "Romans 13", p. 368.
38. Ibid., p. 368.
39. Ibid., p. 370.
40. Ibid., p. 375.

41. O. Cullmann, State in N.T., p. 59.
42. H.N. Ridderbos, Paul: An Outline of His Theology (London: SPCK, 1971), p. 323; cf. Schrage, Christen und Staat, p. 52.
43. Ridderbos, Paul, p. 321.
44. R.S.V. = "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those who exist have been instituted by God".

Jerusalem Bible = "You must all obey the governing authorities. since all government comes from God, the civil authorities were appointed by God".
45. John Murray, The Epistle to the Romans (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1959), p. 147.
46. E. Käsemann, Romans. p. 355
47. If Paul wanted to exhort his readers to "obedience" he could have used any one of three words: πειθαρχεῖν, πειθεσθαι, ὑπακούειν.
48. Cranfield, Romans, p. 662.
49. Villa-Vicencio, Study Guide, p. 135.
50. Cranfield correctly believes that responsible voting is only possible on the basis of adequate knowledge. The Christian is to make sure that he is as fully and reliably informed as possible about political issues: Romans, p. 663
51. Within the South African situation on 22 September 1984 so-called Coloured and Indian citizens had the choice of either voting for one of the parties who

participated in the apartheid constitution or in protest abstaining from voting altogether.

52. Cranfield, Romans, p. 663.
53. J.H. Yoder, Politics of Jesus, p. 212.
54. Villa-Vicencio, p. 136; Schrage, p. 50, notes that Rom. 13 has been misused as a biblical reason for a state metaphysic; Käsemann, Romans, p. 553, says that ὑπερεχούσις is used here without metaphysical background.
55. Käsemann, Romans, pp. 355f.
56. Ibid., 353f.
57. 2 Sam, 12:8; Jer. 27:5f.; Dan. 2:21, 37f.; 4:17, 25, 32; 5:21.
58. C.K. Barrett, The Epistle to the Romans (London: A&C Black, 1957), p. 245.
59. Bruce, Romans, p. 237.
60. Villa-Vicencio, Study Guide, p. 135.
61. Yoder, Politics of Jesus, p. 200.
62. Ibid., p.200
63. Ibid., p. 201.
64. Ibid., p. 201.
65. Ibid., p. 201.
66. Ibid., p. 202.
67. Ibid., p. 203
68. H.G. Liddell, & R. Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon (Oxford: Clarendon, 1855).
69. Barrett, Romans, p. 245; Käsemann, Romans, p. 357
Cranfield, Romans, p. 665; Murray, Romans, p. 149.

70. Cullmann, State in N.T., pp. 55f.
71. Murray, Romans, p. 149: Murray sees the reason why Paul does not deal with the questions which arise in actual practice and in connection with revolution as lying in the fact that the Apostle was not writing an essay on casuistical theology but setting forth the cardinal principles pertaining to the institution of **g**overnment and regulating the behaviour of Christians.
72. Murray, Romans, p. 149; Bruce, Romans, p. 237.
73. Käsemann, Romans, p. 358.
74. Ibid., p. 358
75. Cranfield, Romans, pp. 664f.
76. Ibid., p. 665.
77. Murray, Romans, p. 149
78. Moulder, "Consciencious Disobedience", p. 17.
79. Murray, Romans, p. 154.
80. Villa-Vicencio, Study Guide, p. 137.
81. Cranfield, Romans, p. 668.
82. Frank Staggs, "Rendering to God What Belongs to God", Journal of Church and State, Vol. 18, No. 2 (Spring 1976), p. 222.
83. Villa-Vicencio, Study Guide, p. 138.
84. Käsemann, Romans, p. 359
85. Cranfield, Romans, p. 669.
86. Barrett, Romans, p. 247
87. Yoder, Politics of Jesus, pp. 207-210.
88. Käsemann, Romans, p. 359

89. Ibid., p. 359.
90. Cranfield, Romans, pp. 669ff.
91. Villa-Vicencio, p. 139.
92. Käsemann, Romans, p. 359.
93. Murray, Romans , p. 156.
94. Ibid., p. 156.
95. Cranfield, Service of God, p. 53.
96. Barrett, Romans, p. 248.
97. Ibid., p. 248.
98. Ibid., p. 248.
99. Ibid., p. 248.
100. Cullmann, State in N.T., p. 63.
101. Barrett, Romans, p. 249.
102. Cranfield, Service of God, p. 53.
103. Ibid., p. 52.
104. J.L. Garrett, "Dialectic", pp. 441-2, gives the
above summary to which the present writer has
added.

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

1. Frank Stagg, "Rendering to God", p. 224.
2. Ibid., p. 224.
3. The reader is referred to the wide variety of commentaries which discuss the date and authorship questions in detail, especially:

Robert H. Mounce, The Book of Revelation (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans 1977), pp. 25-36.

J. Massynberde Ford, Revelation (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1975), pp. 28ff.

Christopher Rowland, The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity (New York: Crossroads, 1982), pp. 403-412.

G.K. Beasley-Murray, Revelation (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1974), pp. 32-37.

R.H. Preston & A.T. Hanson, Revelation (London: SCM, 1949), pp. 25-28.

R.H. Charles, Revelation, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh, T&T Clarke, 1920), pp. xxi-cxci.

G.B. Caird, The Revelation of Saint John the Divine (London: A&C Black, 1966), pp. 1-14.

Each of these provides the reader with an extensive bibliography.

5. The "Preterist" school of interpretation is described by George Eldon Ladd in the following terms:

"The prevailing interpretation of Revelation in critical scholarship treats the book as a typical

example of the genre of apocalyptic literature and interprets it in the same way as the apocalypse of Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, IV Ezra, and Baruch are interpreted. Apocalypses are "tracts for bad times". They arise out of times of unusual evil and persecution. God's people cannot understand the problem of evil in history or why such fearful sufferings and persecutions befall them. The apocalypses were written to answer this problem and to encourage a distressed people. The solution is found in the view that God has turned this age over to the powers of evil but is soon to intervene to destroy evil and establish his Kingdom. The message of the apocalypses is addressed to their own contemporaries and in no way contains prophecies of the future, but pseudo-prophecies of history rewritten under the guise of prophecy. All allusions to historical events or personage must be sought in the historical environment of the book itself". Ladd dissociates himself from this approach and discusses four other methods of interpretation, viz. Historical method, Symbolical or Idealist method, Dispensationalism or Extreme Futuristic method, and the Moderate Futurist View to which he himself ascribes. See G.E. Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1974), pp. 621-624.

James Luther Garrett, Jr, in an Editorial entitled "The Dialectic of Romans 13:1-7 and Rev. 13: Part Two", Journal of Church and State, 19 (1977), pp. 9-19, divides English scholarship into four schools of interpretation which roughly coincide with Ladd's categories, namely, Preterist, the Continuous Historical, the Futurists, and the Philosophy of History (or idealist) schools. Garrett's categories are directly parallel to those of R.H. Charles, which are: Contemporary Historical, Church-or-World-Historical, eschatological, and Symbolical-Historical methods of interpretation.

The present writer prefers the Preterist or Contemporary-Historical method.

4. It is impossible to describe John, the writer of Revelation, any closer. Numerous theories about his identity are discussed in the commentaries referred to under our note 3.
6. Austin M. Farrer, The Revelation of St. John the Divine (Oxford: Clarendon, 1964), p. 19.
7. G.B. Caird, Revelation, p. 3.
8. William Barclay, The Revelation of John, Vol. 2 (Edinburgh: St. Andrew's Press, 1959), p. 109, believes that Rev. 13 is the centre and the "essence of the whole book".
9. T.F. Glasson. The Revelation of John (Cambridge University Press, 1965), p. 6, and widely agreed to by scholars. Babylon is also used to indicate

Rome in 1 Peter 5:13.

10. Ibid., p. x.
11. Ibid., p. 7.
12. Annals 15:44.
13. Nero 49.
14. J.M. Ford, p. 211.
15. Sibyline Oracles 4:119-27 reads as follows: "And then from Italy a great king, like a fugitive slave, shall flee unseen, unheard of, over the passage of the Euphrates; when he shall dare even the hateful pollution of a mother's murder, and many other things beside, venturing so far with wicked hand. And many for the throne of Rome shall dye the ground with their blood, when he has run away beyond the Parthian land. And a Roman leader (Titus) shall come to Syria, who shall burn down Solyma's temple with fire, and therewith slay many men, and shall waste the great land of the Jews with its broad way". The man who murdered his mother is most probably Nero. Cf. also Sibyline Oracles 3:28ff. and 5:361-8.
16. At least three pretenders tried to make capital out of this Nero redivivus myth. In A.D. 69, 80 and 88 respectively imposters made attempts to lead rebellions against Rome. Beasley-Murray, p. 120.
17. R.H. Charles, Vol. 1, p. 350.
18. For a full description of the development of emperor-worship, see Isbon T. Beckwith, The Apocalypse

of John (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, Reprint 1967), pp. 198ff., as well as William Barclay, Revelation, Vol. 2, pp. 111-121.

19. Beckwith, p. 200.

20. Ibid., p. 200.

21. Ibid., p. 204f. Domitian is known to have banished Flavia Domitilla and the author of Revelation at least. Beckwith believes that behind was a determination to get rid of persons he deemed politically dangerous because they would not worship him.

22. Ibid., p. 211.

23. The αὐτοῦ in verse 1 and following verses may be either neuter or masculine, meaning "of it" or "of him". δρακὼν (i.e. Satan) being masculine, we have kept to masculine. But θῆριον is neuter. Yet if it stands for a person, as ἀρνίον does in verse 8, it should be treated, as to the pronoun, as a masculine. We have rendered αὐτοῦ by "of him", therefore, just as αὐτόν (him) is used in verse 8, τις (who?) in verse 4, and ὅς (who) in verse 14.

24. According to R.H. Charles, Vol. 1, p. 344, the woman is the Messiah and His community.

25. R.H. Charles, Vol. I, pp. 334-444-

26. Of all the scholars interpretating the beast as the Roman State we shall mention only R.H. Charles, C.K. Beasley-Murray, R.H. Preston, & A.T. Hanson, G.B. Caird, G.E. Ladd, J.L. Garrett, Jr., A.M. Farrer, W. Barclay, I.T. Beckwith, F. Stagg, O.

Cullmann, D.R. Griffiths, J.M. Ford and C. Rowland,
to whose writings reference has already been made.

27. Mounce, p. 250; J.M. Ford, p. 219.

28. The four kingdoms are Babylonia, Media, Persia,
and Greece: Mounce, p. 250 n. 8.

29. Mounce, p. 250. The other suggestion often made
that the diadems had to be on the horns to allow
for space on the heads where the blasphemous names
could be stamped (Moffat) is not convincing. It
is unlikely that John intended the beast to be
visualized with precision; consider for example,
the placing of ten horns on only seven heads and
the location of a mouth on such a beast.

30. R.H. Charles, Vol. I, p. 250.

31. Mounce, p. 250.

32. Ibid., p. 251.

33. W. Barclay, Vol. 2, pp. 109f.

34. Beckwith, p. 708.

35. Ibid., p. 708.

36. Caird, p. 163.

37. Mounce, p. 251.

38. Barclay, pp. 109f.

39. Caird, p. 163.

40. Ibid., p. 164.

41. Ibid., p. 164.

42. Mounce, p. 253.

43. Caird p. 164.

44. Beasley-Murray, p. 210.

45. Beasley-Murray, pp. 209f.; Caird, p. 164; Glasson, p. 80; Charles, p. 349.
46. Caird, p. 165.
47. Charles, Vol. 1, p. 351.
48. Preston & Hanson, p. 97.
49. Mounce, p. 253; O. Cullmann, State in N.T., p. 80.
50. Beasley-Murray, pp. 211f.; O. Cullmann, State in N.T., pp. 79f.

John stood in the apocalyptic tradition which holds that "the Most High rules the kingdom of man, and gives it to whom he will" (Dan. 4:25).

51. Beasley-Murray, p. 212.
52. Ibid., p. 212.
53. Cullmann, State in N.T., p. 79.
54. Beasley-Murray, p. 212, p. 167.
55. Beasley-Murray quotes E. Stauffer, New Testament Theology, p. 67: "However much the idea of Satan has developed since the time of the book of Job, the basic thought of Job 1:6ff. remains true: Satan is an authorized minister of God". His point is that Satan cannot burst out of God's order, but must remain co-ordinated in it. In spite of his enmity he remains God's servant. Beasley-Murray, p. 213.
56. T.F. Glasson, pp. 67-70, 80.
57. Mounce, pp. 221, 245.
58. Ibid., p. 221.
59. Ibid., p. 254.

60. P046* 1 2059 al lat arm Ir^{lat} TR. Metzger says the addition appears to have been made by copyists desiring to "alleviate the strained syntax", A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), p. 748.
61. P⁴⁷ g.
62. Caird, p. 166, feels that "and" was added by the scribes who wished to eliminate a difficulty in interpretation. cf. Mounce, pp. 254f. and Beckwith, p. 637.
63. Caird, p. 167.
64. Beckwith, p. 637.
65. Charles, Vol. I. p. 353.
66. Mounce, p. 255.
67. Glasson, p. 8; Beasley-Murray, pp. 213f.; Caird, p. 168; Mounce, p. 256; Charles, p. 354.
68. A view held by Beckwith, p. 637.
69. R.H. Charles, Vol I, p. 354.
70. Ibid., p. 354.
71. Mounce, p. 256.
72. Caird, wisely warns against reading more into John's doctrine of predestination than he intends. The apocalyptist is not saying that the inhabitants of earth will worship the beast because they have no choice, because this is the fate to which they have been destined from all eternity. John's doctrine springs from the biblical idea that salvation is from start to finish the unmerited act of God.

But he constantly qualifies it with an equally strong statement of human responsibility. A man's name may be removed from the book of life (Rev. 3:5); and when the last judgment comes, there are record books to be opened as well as the book of life (Rev. 20:12). John does not make fully qualified statements, which would show how predestination and free will are related to one another. "He simply sets the two beliefs side by side without qualification and allows the one to qualify the other", p. 168.

73. Mounce, p. 256.

74. For a detailed discussion of the textual variants the reader is referred to Bruce Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek N.T., pp. 749f.

75. ἀπάγει , 172 424 pc g vg^s, cl sy sa Irlat Prim;
296 TR read συναγει .

76. This change requires dropping δέι and taking αὐτόν as a corruption of αὐτός . (cf. Charles, I, p355).

77. Charles, Vol 1, p. 355.

78. Mounce, p. 257.

79. Caird, p. 170.

80. Barclay, p. 127.

81. Mounce, p. 257

82. Beckwith, p. 638.

83. See note 6 of the present chapter.

84. cf. 2 Esdras 6:49-52; 2 Baruch 29:4; Job 40:15-41:34.

85. Beasley-Murray, p. 216.
86. Mounce, p. 258.
87. Beasley-Murray, p. 216; Caird, p. 172.
88. Mounce, p. 259.
89. H.B. Swete, The Apocalypse of St. John (London: SCM, 3rd ed. 1909), p. 169.
90. Mounce, p. 259.
91. Charles, Vol. 1, p. 358.
92. F.F. Bruce, "The Revelation of John", A New Testament Commentary, p. 653, is cited by Mounce, p. 258.
93. Mounce, p. 259.
94. Ibid., p. 259.
95. Beasley-Murray, p. 217.
96. Ibid., p. 216.
97. Caird, p. 171.
98. Cullmann, State in N.T., p. 76.
99. Caird, p. 171; Beasley-Murray, p. 216.
100. Caird, p. 172.
101. Bruce, p. 653.
102. Mounce, p. 260.
103. Charles, Vol. I, p. 360.
104. Ibid., p. 360.
105. Barclay, pp. 127f.
106. Charles, Vol. I, p. 360.
107. Caird, p. 172; Beckwith, p. 640; Beasley-Murray, p. 217; Barclay, p. 128.
108. Caird, p. 172.

109. Beckwith, p. 640, I, p. 360; Mounce, p. 260.
110. Charles, I, p. 361, who cites Theophilus ad Autol.
i, 8 and Athenagorus Leg. 18 as sources.
112. Caird, p. 172; p. 261.
113. Leon Morris, The Revelation of St. John (Tyndale
N.T. Commentaries: Intervarsity Press), p. 172.
114. Mounce, p. 261.
115. Caird, p. 177.
116. Mounce, p. 262.
117. Ibid., p. 173: We note that in Rev. 13:16 and 14:9
the mark is on the brow or the hand, while in 20:4
it is on both.
118. G.A. Deissmann, Bible Studies, Eng. ed. by A. Grieve
(New York: Harper and Brothers, 1901), p. 242.
119. J.M. Ford, p. 225; Mounce, p. 262; Caird, p. 173;
Charles, I, p. 362; Barclay, p. 129.
120. W.M. Ramsay, The Letters to the Seven Churches of
Asia (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House,
1979 reprint), pp. 110f.
121. Preston & Hanson, p. 99.
122. Caird, p. 173.
123. Mounce, p. 262.
124. Ibid., p. 262.
125. Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Political Perspective
of the Revelation to John", Journal of Biblical
Literature, 96 (1977), p. 253.
126. Mounce, p. 263 n. 53, argues^{that} the "η" used here is
roughly equivalent to τοῦτ' ἐστίν . That the scribes

were puzzled by the syntax is clear from the alternatives offered: it is the mark η' τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θηρίου (P⁴⁷ 1778 pc g vg^{S,cl}TR), the mark τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ θηρίου (C 2028 pc (vg^w) sy Ir) , the mark τοῦ θηρίου η' τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (℣ pc).

127. The first nine letters of the Greek alphabet, according to Mounce, p. 263, stood for the numbers 1 to 9, the next nine letter stood for the numbers 10 to 90, etc. Certain obsolete letters and signs were used to make up for the shortage of letters in Greek alphabet. Every name, therefore, could be expressed in numbers. In Sibylline Oracles 1:324ff. Jesus' number in Greek is 888.

128. Mounce, pp. 263ff.

129. Beasley-Murray, p. 207.

130. Collins, pp. 246ff.

131. Ibid., p. 247..

132. Although some manuscripts omit this statement Bruce N. Metzger asserts that the omission may be due to haplography: A Textual Commentary on the Greek N.T. (London: United Bible Societies, 1971), p. 749.

133. Collins, p. 248.

134. Ibid., p. 248.

135. Ibid., p. 250.

136. Ibid., p. 251.

137. Ibid., p. 254.

138. Ibid., p. 252.

139. Frank Stagg, "Rendering to God", p. 217.
140. Ibid., p. 217.
141. Ibid., p. 217.
142. Aleksandr Solzhenitzyn, The Gulag Archipelago, E.T. Thomas P. Whitney (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), p. 173f.
143. Staff, "Rendering to God", p. 218.
144. Ibid., p. 218.
145. Stagg, "Rendering to God", p. 221.
146. Ibid., p. 218.
147. Stagg, "Rendering to God", pp. 221f.
148. Examples of civil disobedience from the Bible are Joseph's rejection of the summons of Potifar's wife, Jeremiah's refusal to keep quiet or withdraw his prophecy (Jer. 26:1-16), Peter and his fellow disciples' refusal to obey the Sanhedrin's command no longer to preach in the name Jesus, and many others.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

1. O. Cullmann, State in the New Testament, p. 90.
2. Wolfgang Schrage, Christen und der Staat, p. 77.
3. Cullmann, State in N.T., Although we have ^{not} found any illustrations of the prophetic role of Christians to the State in the ministry of Jesus this important task of religion is well illustrated throughout the Old Testament and would have been taken for granted by Jesus.
4. Ibid., pp. 90f.
5. E.Käsemann, Romans, p. 359

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Applebaum, Shimon. "The Zealots: The Case for Revaluation",
Journal of Roman Studies, 16 (1971).
2. Bammel, E & Moule, C.F.D. (eds). Jesus and the Politics of
His Day (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984)
3. Barclay, W. The Revelation of John, 2 (Edinburgh: St.
Andrew's Press, 1959)
4. Barrett, C.K. The Gospel According to John (London:
SPCK, 1955)
5. Beasley-Murray, G.K. Revelation (London: Marshall, Morgan
& Scott, 1974)
6. Beckwith, I.T. The Apocalypse of John (Grand Rapids,
Michigan: Baker Book House, 1967)
7. Borg, Marcus. "A New Context for Romans 13", New Testament
Studies, 19 (1973)
8. Borg, Marcus. "The Currency of the Term 'Zealot'", Journal
of Theological Studies, 22 (1971)
9. Bornkamm, G. Jesus of Nazareth (London: Hodder & Stoughton,
1960)
10. Brandon, S.G.F. Jesus and the Zealots (Manchester:
University Press, 1967)
11. Brandon, S.G.F. "Jesus and the Zealots: Aftermath", John
Rylands Library Bulletin, 54 (1971)
12. Bruce, F.F. "Paul and 'The Powers that Be'", John Rylands
Library Bulletin, 66, 2 (1984)
13. Bruce, F.F. Romans (Leicester: Intervarsity Press, 1963)

14. Bultmann, R. The History of the Synoptic Tradition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963)
15. Caird, G.B. The Revelation of St. John the Divine (London: A & C Black, 1966)
16. Catchpole, D.R. The Trial of Jesus (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971)
17. Charles, R.H. Revelation (Edinburgh: T & T Clarke, 1920)
18. Collins, A.Y.C. "The Political Perspective of the Revelation to John", Journal of Biblical Literature, 96 (1977)
19. Cranfield, C.E.B. Epistle to the Romans (London: SCM, 1980)
20. Cranfield, C.E.B. The Service of God (London: Epworth Press, 1965)
21. Cullmann, Oscar. Christ and Time (London: SCM, 1951)
22. Cullmann, Oscar. Christology of the New Testament (London: SCM, 1959)
23. Cullman, Oscar. The State in the New Testament (London: SCM, 1957)
24. Derrett, J.D.M. Law in the New Testament (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970)
25. Dibelius, M. Jesus (E.T. by C.B. Hedrick & F.C. Grant, London: 1963)
26. Dunn, G.D.G. "The Messianic Secret in Mark", Tynedale Bulletin, 21 (1970)
27. Farrer, Austin M. The Revelation of St. John the Divine (Oxford: Clarendon, 1964)
28. Flusser, David. The Trial and Death of Jesus of Nazareth (London: SCM, 1969)
29. Garrett, J.L. "The Dialectic of Romans 13:1 - 7 and

- Revelation 13: Part One". Journal of the Church and State, 18, 3 (1976)
30. Garrett, J.L. "The Dialectic of Romans 13: 1 - 7 and Revelation 13: Part Two", Journal of Church and State, 19, 1 (1977)
 31. Glasson, T.F. The Revelation of John (Cambridge University Press, 1965)
 32. Hengel, Martin. Was Jesus a Revolutionist? (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971)
 33. Hutchinson, S. "The Political Implications of Rom 13:1 - 7", Biblical Theology, 21 (1971)
 34. Kallas, J. "Romans 13:1 - 7: An Interpolation", New Testament Studies, 2 (1964)
 35. Käsemann, E. Essays on New Testament Themes (London:SCM, 1964)
 36. Käsemann, E. N.T. Questions of Today (London: SCM, 1969)
 37. Käsemann, E. Commentary on Romans (London: SCM, 1980)
 38. Kilpatrick, G.D. The Trial of Jesus (Oxford: 1953)
 39. Ladd, G.E. A Theology of the New Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1974)
 40. Lombard, H.A. "Jesus en die 'Selote': 'n Ondersoek van die begrip 'Ywer vir God's Koninkryk'", Theologia Evangelica, IX, 2 (1976)
 41. Marshall, I.H. The Gospel of Luke (Exeter: Paternoster, 1978)
 42. Massynberde-Ford, J. Revelation (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1975)
 43. Moulder, James. "Romans 13 and Consciencious Disobedience",

Journal of Theology for Southern Africa, 21 (1977)

44. Mounce, R.H. The Book of Revelation (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1977)
45. Munro, Winsome. Authority in Paul and Peter, SNTS Monograph Series 45 (Cambridge, 1983)
46. Murray, J. The Epistle to the Romans (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1959)
47. Nolan, Albert. Jesus before Christianity: The Gospel of Liberation (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976)
48. Ogle, Arthur Bud. "What is left for Caesar?" Theology Today, 35 (1978)
49. O'Neill, J.C. Paul's Letter to the Romans (London: (1975)
50. Pixley, George V. "God's Kingdom in First Century Palestine", The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics, ed. N.K. Gottwald (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1983)
51. Preston, R.H. & Hanson, A.T. Revelation (London: SCM, 1949)
52. Ramsay, W.M. The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1979)
53. Ridderbos, H. Paul: An Outline of His Theology
54. Roth, C. "The Zealots - A Jewish Religious Sect", Judaism, 8 (1959)
55. Rowland, C. The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity (New York: Crossroads, 1982)
56. Sanday, W. & Headlam, A. The Epistle to the Romans (Edin-

burgh: T & T Clarke, 1895)

57. Schrage, Wolfgang. Die Christen und der Staat nach dem Neuen Testament (Gütersloher: Gerd Mohn, 1970)
58. Schürer, Emil. The History of the Jewish People in the Age Of Jesus, Vol. 2, Revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black (Edinburgh: T & T Clarke, 1979)
60. Schweizer, E. The Good News according to Mark (Atlanta: John Knox, 1970)
61. Sherwin-White, A.N. Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963)
62. Sherwin-White, A.N. The Trial of Christ: Historicity and Chronology in the New Testament (London: SPCK, 1965)
63. Smith, Morton. "Zealots and Sicarii: Their Origins and Relations", Harvard Theological Review, 64 (1971)
64. Solomonsen, B. "Some remarks on the Zealots with special regard to the term 'Qannaim' in Rabbinic Literature", New Testament Studies, 12 (1965)
65. Stagg, Frank. "Rendering to Caesar what belongs to Caesar: Christian Engagement with the World", Journal of Church and State, 18, 1, (1976)
66. Stagg, Frank. "Rendering to God what belongs to God: Christian Disengagement from the World", Journal of Church and State, 18, 2, (1976)
67. Taylor, Vincent. The Gospel according to St. Mark (London: MacMillan & Co., 1957)
68. Turner, Nigel. "The Church's attitude to the State in the New Testament", Journal of Theology for Southern

Africa, 2 (1973)

70. Villa-Vicencio, C. Unisa Study Guide on Biblical Ethics
(Pretoria: Unisa, 1979)
71. Wanamaker, C.A. "Jesus: A Disturber of Uneasy Peace",
(Unpublished Paper, University of Cape Town)
72. Whiston, W. Josephus: Complete Works (Grand Rapids, Michigan:
Kregel Publications, 1960)
73. Wilcox, Max. "Jesus in the light of his Jewish Environment",
Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt II, 25.1, Religion (1982).
74. Yoder, J.H. The Politics of Jesus (Grand Rapids, Michigan:
Eerdmans, 1912)
75. Zeitlin, Solomon. "Masada and the Sicarii", Jewish
Quarterly Review, 55 (1964)
76. Zeitlin, Solomon. "The Crucifixion of Jesus Re-examined,
Jewish Quarterly Review", 31 (1941)